COMPARISON OF COLLEGE STUDENT LEADERSHIP PROGRAMS FROM THE 1970s TO THE 1990s

DISSERTATION

Presented to the Graduate Council of the

University of North Texas in Partial

Fulfillment of the Requirements

For the Degree of

DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

By

Keri Leigh Rogers McMillon, B.S., M.A.

Denton, Texas

August, 1997

McMillon, Keri Leigh Rogers, Comparison of college student leadership programs from the 1970s to the 1990s. Doctor of Philosophy (Higher Education), August, 1997, 102 pp., 27 tables, references, 46 titles.

The primary concerns of this study were to describe the most common practices of current college student leadership training programs in the United States and to compare the 1979 and 1997 findings by replicating the 1979 Simonds study. This study provides an overview of related literature on the history of leadership theory and the research on leadership training in higher education, a detailed description of the methodology, results of the survey, a comparative analysis of the 1979 and 1997 findings, and discussion of the current status of leadership training at institutions of higher education. Conclusions are drawn, and implications and recommendations for student affairs professionals are made that may improve the quality of student leadership in higher education.

The questionnaire was mailed to 365 institutions out of a total population of 1,463 institutions. Two hundred thirty-five (64 %) usable responses were received. There were 174 colleges and universities (74 %) with leadership training programs as opposed to only 43.5 percent with programs in 1979.

The data from this study revealed the following information as compared to the 1979 findings: The goals of leadership training programs have not changed. As anticipated, staff members continue to be the initiators, planners, implementers, and evaluators of programs. Student and faculty involvement has grown over the years but remains low. Leadership training programs have seen more support over the past 20 years through increased staffing and funding. Concepts such as community service/service

learning, the Myers-Briggs Type Indicator, gender issues, and multicultural issues are now utilized more often than management by objectives and transactional analysis. Although most programs were evaluated, a systematic evaluation process still does not exist at most institutions.

Recommendations for this study include studying academic affairs based programs and integrated programs, working with faculty more closely to integrate an interdisciplinary approach to leadership training, using needs assessments to assist staff in planning leadership development programs, developing and utilizing objective evaluative processes so that programs can be adapted appropriately, repeating the study or a similar study in 10 years, and conducting longitudinal studies on leadership training programs.

COMPARISON OF COLLEGE STUDENT LEADERSHIP PROGRAMS FROM THE 1970s TO THE 1990s

DISSERTATION

Presented to the Graduate Council of the

University of North Texas in Partial

Fulfillment of the Requirements

For the Degree of

DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

By

Keri Leigh Rogers McMillon, B.S., M.A.

Denton, Texas

August, 1997

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I would like to thank my family, friends, and colleagues for their moral support throughout this educational process. Their understanding and encouragement have made it easier to keep going even when my energies were depleted. I would especially like to thank Dad, Mother, Mimi, and Jerry who have been the closest to me during this process.

I would also like to thank Professors Howard Smith, William Miller, and Jill Rhea for the advice, guidance, and understanding they have provided. I appreciate the wealth of knowledge and time they have shared with me over the past few years.

A special note of appreciation goes to my mother for her proofreading skills, my husband for his computer knowledge, and Professor Gary Kelley for his statistical advice.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES

CHAPTER I

PROBLEM, PURPOSE, AND SIGNIFICANCE

Introduction

In the past decade, leadership training has gone through a change defined by current theories of leadership. Visionary theories have replaced theories of management, power, and situational leadership. Although leadership training programs have continued at institutions of higher education, it is not known with certainty to what extent these programs exist and whether or not these programs have changed to reflect a theoretical base of visionary leadership. This first chapter states the purpose and significance of the study, identifies the research questions, provides an overview of the methodology, identifies limitations, and defines key terms.

Statement of the Problem

The primary concerns of the study were to describe the most common practices of current college student leadership training programs around the nation and to compare the 1979 and 1997 findings by replicating the 1979 Simonds study. Through this comparison, it was expected that the information gathered would enable student affairs professionals more effectively to project leadership training programs for the future.

To respond to the purpose of this study, the research questions were formulated. They are as follows:

1. Are more colleges and universities currently conducting student leadership training programs than in 1979?

2. How have the goals, purposes, and planning of these programs changed since 1979?

3. How does student, staff, and faculty involvement compare with the involvement in 1979?

4. Are participants selected in the same manner as in 1979?

5. How has the content of the student leadership training programs changed since 1979?

6. What types of physical and financial arrangements are used in comparison to those used in 1979?

7. How do the methods currently being used in student leadership training compare to those used in 1979?

8. What methods of evaluation are being used now in comparison to those used in 1979?

Significance of the Study

The need for effective student leadership training has not diminished through the years. What has changed is the importance placed on leadership training and the methods used. In order to ensure future citizen leadership and address current trends in leadership, it is necessary (a) to study the changes that have been made in leadership training

programs and (b) to provide these findings to those professionals who program leadership training.

Caruso (1981), McIntire (1989), and Roberts and Ullom (1989) stated that the primary purpose of higher education in early America was to develop leadership. The nation did not have an aristocracy to provide citizens for positions of leadership to ensure the country's future. After the Civil War, America entered into an era defined by students being treated as adults. Students were given more opportunities to participate in leadership positions in student activities and organizations (Caruso, 1981, p. 9). Student leadership opportunities have continued to grow, and the development of leaders remains a key factor in the missions of institutions of higher education. Shandley (1989) stated, "The never-ending need for effective leaders for our organizations, communities, states, and country has brought a special urgency to this call for leadership" (p. 59). According to Bennis and Nanus (1985), "Leadership seems to be the marshaling of skills possessed by a majority but used by a minority. But it's something that can be learned by anyone, taught to everyone, denied to no one" (p. 27).

Preissler and Hadley (1992) found that "students who hold cocurricular leadership roles revealed most positive attitudes about careers and enhanced abilities to look ahead when making career choices" (p. 119). In a study conducted by Cooper, Healy, and Simpson (1994), leadership roles appeared to "provide the opportunity to sustain and further develop developmental skills" (p. 101). The involved student is more successful academically and socially. Student affairs staff can facilitate and develop these successes by providing leadership training opportunities.

Caruso (1981) observed the following:

> [In the mid 1600s], the system designed to provide for the growth of students and their preparation for positions of leadership in society was based on prescriptions by the faculty and other leaders in these colonial colleges, rather that upon any systematic effort to recognize individual developmental needs and differences. (p. 8)

Larkin (1981) believes that most campuses are just beginning to make leadership programs an important part of the curriculum. If institutions of higher education are to develop leaders, then the classroom education must develop the total person (p. 50). But change is slow. Bennis (1989) believes that universities are not doing much to change (p. 16). According to Bennis and Nanus (1985), "Management education is, unfortunately, the appropriate description for that which goes on in most formal education and training programs, both within and outside universities" (p. 219). Moore and Parker (1990) found the following:

> The approach to how we "teach" leadership has changed radically during the past decade. The new theories of visionary leaders, the flattening of the American company, the leadership versus management approach, and the increasing diversity of leadership styles have all had an impact on the way we train student leaders. (p. 37)

Limitations of the Study

Limitations of this study include the length and age of the survey instrument, the lack of statistical information, the use of a nonparametric statistical test, and the

population. Since the Simonds study was conducted in 1978, new methods and theories of leadership training have emerged. The use of older methods has virtually disappeared. Because of this, some questions were outdated. Also, the length of the survey instrument may have affected the response rate. As a result of the Simonds survey's not reporting some of the statistical data, statistical comparisons were not made on all of the questions. Finally, this study summarized information for only 4-year colleges and universities. Two-year institutions were not included.

Definitions of Terms

According to Stogdill (1974), the word leader appeared in the English language about 1300. The term leadership appeared in 1800. Since that time, leadership has been defined in many ways -- a strategy for needs fulfillment, a predisposition toward human nature, a level of maturity, a structural approach to behavioral modification, a process of change, and vision (Cosgrove, 1988; Simonds, 1979). Bennis (1989) stated, "To an extent, leadership is like beauty: it's hard to define, but you know it when you see it" (p. 1). For the purpose of this study, leadership was defined in the same manner as it was in the Simonds study. "Leadership will be defined as the behavioral process of influencing individuals or groups toward the set goals of their organization" (Barrow, 1977, p. 232).

Leadership training programs were defined in the same manner as in the Simonds (1979) study. Simonds's definition was a modification of the definition used by the Wright study in 1967. "Formal leadership training programs were defined as specifically designed programs instituted by staff members which present leadership knowledge and skills to undergraduate students" (Simonds, 1979, p. 2).

Organization of the Study

The purpose of this study was to describe the most common practices of current college student leadership training programs in the United States and to compare the 1979 and 1997 findings. Chapter 2 provides an overview of related literature on the history of leadership theory and research on leadership training in higher education. Chapter 3 presents a detailed description of the methodology used, and chapter 4 relates the results of the survey and a comparative analysis of the 1979 and 1997 findings. Chapter 5 is a summary of the study with a discussion of the current status of leadership training in 4-year institutions of higher education in comparison with the Simonds (1979) study. Conclusions are drawn and implications and recommendations for student affairs professionals are made that may improve the quality of student leadership training in higher education.

CHAPTER II

RELATED LITERATURE

History of Leadership Theory

Leadership theories and models have sought to explain what makes a person a leader and the characteristics of leadership (Stogdill, 1974). Although there have been many studies and theories, leadership is still not completely understood. The first theories of leadership presented a single aspect of the process. Recently, broader theories of leadership have been presented that include more than one aspect of the total leadership process. According to Yukl (1994), "A general theory of leadership that explains all aspects of the process adequately has yet to be developed" (p.19).

The first of the leadership theories, the "Great Man Theory," dealt with the personal attributes of a leader. In 1869, Galton studied the background of great men to discover inherited characteristics that would explain their leadership. The trait theories that followed in the 1920s, 1930s, and 1940s stated that all leaders possessed certain characteristics. If these traits could be identified in people, they could be made leaders. None of these theories proved to be of any value because they did not consider that different traits and skills are used in different situations.

Situational theory stated, "The leader is the product of a situation" (Bass, 1990, p. 38). The emergence of a leader was the result of time, place, and circumstance. Personal-situational theorists studied the interplay between the individual and situational elements.

One theorist contended that "the great man needs help—that his talents needed to fit with the situation" (Bass, 1990, p. 39).

Behavioral or humanistic theory research was conducted primarily in the 1950s and 1960s. Two principal research programs were pioneered by Ohio State University and the University of Michigan. These theories stressed the importance of effective organizations through individual development. The main objective of the Ohio State University leadership studies was to identify and describe effective leadership behaviors. The results were that followers perceived their leader's behavior in terms of two broadly defined categories labeled as consideration and initiating structure (Yukl, 1994, p.54). The focus of the Michigan leadership studies was to identify relationships among leader behavior, group processes, and measures of group performance. Some of the most famous theorists are McGregor, Argyris, Likert, Blake and Mouton, Maslow, and Hersey and Blanchard.

Psychoanalytic leadership theories were addressed by such theorists as Freud and Erikson. These theorists believed the leader to be a father figure, "as a source of love or fear, as the embodiment of the super ego, and as the emotional outlet for followers' frustrations and destructive aggression" (Bass, 1990, p. 41). These theories have been used to interpret leaders' accomplishments through their childhood experiences.

Interaction and social learning theories and models sought to explain the relationship and consequences of the leader's interaction with followers and situations. Contingency models followed the theory that personal leadership qualities, characteristics of the group, and situations interact to produce leadership in terms of the satisfaction and

achievements of followers. Bass (1990) stated, "The effectiveness of task-oriented and relations-oriented leaders is contingent on the demands imposed by the situation" (p. 46). Other interaction and social learning theories include the path-goal theory and Yukl's (1994) multiple-linkage model.

Theories of interaction process, including exchange and communication theories, suggest that interaction continues because it is socially satisfying to group members. Individuals must be aware of their potential to fulfill their needs and then apply that contribution toward completing organizational goals. Communication theorists developed a rhetorical foundation to analyze the success of emerging leaders in groups searching for leadership (Bass, 1990, p. 49).

Participative leadership is a cognitive approach to leadership that encourages the use of decision making to allow followers to have input into the leader's decision (Yukl, 1994, p. 157). Types of participative leadership include consultation, joint decision making, power sharing, and decentralization. Research in this area began in the late 1930s and continues in the 1990s. Well-known theorists include Tannenbaum and Schmidt and Vroom and Yetton. Other managerial and leadership theorists, such as Peters and Waterman and Kouzes and Posner, also support the participative leadership theories.

Charismatic leadership and transformational leadership are seen by some theorists to be the same, but others have chosen to distinguish between them. Early charismatic leadership theorists contended that "influence is based not on tradition or formal authority but rather on follower perceptions that the leader is endowed with exceptional qualities"

(Yukl, 1994, p. 317). More recently, charisma has been viewed as a perception of the followers that is influenced by the leader's characteristics.

According to Bass (1990), "Cognitive, behavioral, and interactional explanations are likely to be needed to account fully for leader-follower relations and outcomes from them" (p. 52). Therefore, leadership is a transformation.

> [Transformational leadership] asks followers to transcend their own self interests for the good of the group, organization or society; to consider their longer-term needs to develop themselves, rather than their needs of the moment; and to become more aware of what is really important. (p. 53)

The leader builds in the team members the expectation of high performance. Transformational theorists include Tichy and Devanna and Bennis and Nanus.

Manz and Sims (1989) proposed, "In many modern situations the most appropriate leader is the one who can lead others to lead themselves" (p. xv). This is referred to as "SuperLeadership." According to Allen (1990), current assumptions concerning leadership include the belief that leadership occurs at the top of an organization, that only one model or theory is presented, that leadership is connected to power, and that certain skills can be taught to others (p. 58). As the world changes, these assumptions will also change. Organization leaders who think in terms of intangibles, a global view, and flexibility represent some of the changes that can and will be seen.

The one debate that will continue is the question of whether leaders are born or made. Many of these theories address this question, and many theorists contend that

leaders are made. Kouzes and Posner (1987) stated, "Every exceptional leader we know is also a learner" (p. 277).

Research on Leadership Training in Higher Education

According to Wright (1967), the first laboratory research on educational leadership was conducted in 1947 by a group called the National Training Laboratories (NTL). It was based on a 1946 community leadership training program in Bethel, Maine, to "build bridges between the social scientist and the practitioner attempting to apply scientific knowledge in solving day-to-day problems" (Lippitt, 1961, p. iii). The focus of the 1947 research was to find methods to develop leadership in school-age youth (p. 7). NTL methods were based on discovering a person's thoughts and feelings. These methods were popular in the late 1950s and 1960s in management settings, as well as educational settings. NTL's popularity died because of the concern that participants might suffer psychological damage from inexperienced trainers.

A popular method of research on leadership training programs has been the evaluation of these programs. Two such programs were conducted in the 1950s. Wilson Pruitt's 1956 study focused on leadership training at Teachers College Center for Improving Group Procedures. In 1959, Irving Greger studied the Bernard M. Baruch College's leadership training program.

Since the 1960s, several studies have been conducted on college student leadership training programs. The Wright (1967), Breen (1970), Simonds (1979), Marchetti (1985), and the Gregory and Britt (1986) studies described student leadership training programs on college campuses. A brief summary of the findings follows.

Donald Wright conducted a study in 1967 to identify and describe the best leadership training programs for 4-year undergraduate institutions. A postcard survey revealed that 87 institutions received an excellent rating on their leadership training programs. The best 7 were identified and examined in greater detail. Wright provided recommendations based on these 7 programs. A limitation of this study was that the other 80 programs were not studied.

A "Survey of Selected Programs for Student Leadership Training at Colleges and Universities" was conducted by Daniel G. Breen in 1970. Forty of the 65 respondents had leadership training programs. The study revealed six common elements of basic leadership training programs: Although students were almost always involved in planning the programs, the student activities department took the major role in the planning and implementation. Effective programs usually involved small groups and experience-based learning of an interpersonal and problem-solving nature, with the theory and lecture kept to a minimum. Sessions in which participants were allowed to react to programs were beneficial. Weekend formats were popular, and the best programs cost money (Breen, 1970, p. 17).

In 1979, Peter W. Simonds found that 87 of the 200 survey respondents had leadership training programs. The three most important purposes of leadership training programs were identified as (a) developing effective leadership skills, (b) developing an additional educational component for the student activities programs, and (c) promoting smooth transitions from year to year within student organizations (Simonds, 1979, p. 36-37). The study concluded that leadership training programs were initiated, planned, and

implemented by staff members. Leadership consultants were infrequently used. The number of programs probably did not increase substantially from 1969 to 1979, and this lack of growth could be attributed in part to the self-perception of student activities professionals that their responsibility was to react to student initiative. Simonds also found that the use of "sensitivity training" had been eliminated from leadership training programs and that instructional technology was not used extensively. The programs were not sufficiently removed from the everyday distractions of college life to optimize their effectiveness, and they appeared to lack serious intent and a firm scientific basis (pp. 72-92).

John Marchetti (1985) conducted a study of 2-year college student leadership training programs. The survey instrument included several questions from the Simonds (1979) study. This study reinforced many of the earlier findings of the Simonds and Breen studies: The primary responsibility for conducting leadership training programs was in the student activities office; small-group discussion and problem solving were used to transmit leadership skills; most programs lasted for an entire weekend; staff members were the primary instructors; and both written and oral evaluations were conducted on the programs. In addition, Marchetti also found that the majority of 2-year colleges spent less than $3,000 annually on leadership training programs. Although many campuses relied on multiple funding sources, the primary source of funding was student activities funds. Two-year colleges conducted between one and five training programs per academic year, and the training issues were usually identified through informal discussions with students (Marchetti, 1985, pp. 1-2).

In 1986, Robert A. Gregory and Sara K. Britt, in association with the Center for Creative Leadership conducted a study on 500 leadership educational and/or developmental programs and courses using interviews, campus visits, and a survey. The data revealed 10 conclusions concerning good leadership training programs. Proper selection of participants is critical to program success. The programs have a sound philosophical basis and plans for evaluation. Effective programs have thoughtful goals, tend to be longer term, employ a variety of training methods, and pay explicit attention to leadership. Gregory and Britt also found that interdisciplinary programs held more promise and that the programs that awarded "credit" earned more respect and credibility. Furthermore, the more comprehensive the program, the better (Gregory & Britt, 1987, pp. 32-35).

In 1993, the Higher Education Research Institute at University of California, Los Angeles, received a grant from the Eisenhower Leadership Program of the United States Department of Education. The research project members developed a guidebook of leadership development for college students titled A Social Change Model of Leadership Development (1995). The basic premise was that "the approach proposed . . . differs in certain basic ways from traditional approaches that view 'leaders' only as those who happen to hold formal leadership positions and that regard 'leadership' as a value-neutral process involving positional 'leaders' and 'followers'" (Higher Education Research Institute, 1995, p. 4).

This model presented "a nonhierarchical form of leadership, where the 'leader' functions as a catalyst and facilitator in enabling the group to act collectively in

accomplishing the common vision" (Higher Education Research Institute, 1995, p. 5). It is aimed at clarifying values, developing self-awareness, trusting, listening, serving, collaborating, and changing for the common good. The model encouraged the use of small-group work to develop the group as well as the individual.

Although several studies have been conducted to identify and describe student leadership training programs at institutions of higher education, no studies have been done to compare and contrast what has been done in the past and what is being done currently. This study examined current trends in student leadership development as compared to the trends that were identified in the Simonds (1979) study.

CHAPTER III

RESEARCH DESIGN AND METHODOLOGY

Introduction

This study was designed to produce a description of leadership training programs at 4-year degree-granting institutions of higher education and to compare the findings with the Simonds (1979) study findings. The questionnaire used in this study was developed by Simonds for his study, the selection of the sample followed the Simonds study selection. Four-year undergraduate colleges and universities were selected in a systematic random manner.

Data were analyzed both descriptively and statistically. Descriptive comparisons between the Simonds (1979) study and this study were made using frequency and percentage distribution tables. Chi-square goodness-of-fit tests were used when dealing with nominal data. These chi-square tests were used to determine whether significant differences existed at the .05 level of significance between the 1979 and 1997 survey results.

Population and Sampling Procedures

The selection of the sample followed the Simonds (1979) study selection procedures, except that the Higher Education Publications (HEP) Directory Computer Program was used, not the HEGIS Directory Computer Program. The HEP Directory Computer Program was programmed to select the name and institutional address of the

"chief student life officer" at 4-year, degree-granting institutions with a full-time equivalent (FTE) category of over 500. This group served the population from which the sample was drawn. The names were divided into the FTE enrollment categories. The institutions with the FTE category "under 500" were eliminated from the Simonds study because many of them were specialty or religious institutions that would have a much smaller chance of having a leadership program.

The mailing labels were printed in four columns and divided into the FTE categories to be used in this study. Institutions fitting Carnegie's classification of "professional schools and other specialized institutions" were eliminated from the study. The institutions remaining in the first column were used for the study.

Sample

Based upon the Simonds (1979) study return rate of 70 percent, the anticipated rate of return for this study was greater than 50 percent. Questionnaires were sent to the defined sample of 365 institutions out of the total population of 1,463 institutions. According to Olejnik (1984), this is a sufficient sample size for the chi-square test at the .05 level of significance, with power of .7 for a medium effect size (p. 45). Daniel (1990) concurred: "A sample size of at least 30 is adequate in most practical applications, provided that none of the expected frequencies is too small" (p. 307).

Instrument

The questionnaire used in this study was developed by Simonds (1979) for his study on college student leadership programs. To provide an initial foundation for the development of the questionnaire, Simonds interviewed Dennis Roberts, Irving Greger,

and Martha Gonski, whom he considered authorities in the leadership training area at that time. The specific items used for the questionnaire were developed at interviews conducted at six metropolitan New York colleges and universities. This provided a mix of public and private, residential and commuter, large and small, and urban, rural, and suburban colleges and universities. Two of these colleges had been identified by the Wright (1967) study as institutions with "above average" leadership training programs. Two institutions did not have any leadership training programs.

Five to eight staff members in student affairs participated in the interviews conducted at each institution. In order to assure that the questions were generated by the interviewees, the interviews were held in a nondirective format, with Simonds providing more directive remarks when necessary.

Prior to the pilot study, the questions were organized and modified to follow basic principles of questionnaire design. The pilot study verified that all major areas of leadership training programs had been covered. The questionnaire was modified to eliminate duplication and clarify meaning. It should be noted that several more options were added to the Simonds (1979) questionnaire to better reflect some of the more recently developed concepts or theories.

Since Simonds (1979) did not report reliability or validity of the survey instrument, a large sample was used to insure that the survey instrument would discriminate adequately. The validity of this instrument is also unknown, although it does appear to have face validity. That is, it appears to measure what it claims to measure.

Data Collection Procedures

The initial mailing, containing the Simonds (1979) survey (Appendix C), a cover letter (Appendix B), and a self-addressed, stamped envelope, was sent to the chief student life officers at 365 selected colleges and universities. The initial mailing was followed with a postcard reminder (Appendix D) 21 days later. A final mailing of the survey, another cover letter (Appendix E), and a self-addressed, stamped envelope followed after another 21 days. The chief student life officer was given instructions to have the best-informed staff member complete the questionnaire and send any additional information that would be helpful in understanding the leadership training program. The deadline for response was 8 weeks following the initial mailing.

The first mailing was sent out December 31, 1996. The deadline was February 26, 1997. Two hundred thirty-five (64.4 %) usable responses were received and used in the study.

Analysis of Data

Data were analyzed both descriptively and statistically. Descriptive comparisons between the Simonds (1979) study and this study were made, using frequency and percentage distribution tables. The chi-square goodness-of-fit test was used when dealing with nominal data. The chi-square goodness-of-fit test was utilized because the data from the two studies could be compared, and statistical significance computed. Also, the standardized residual could be calculated to determine the contributing factors to significance. When expected frequencies of less than one occurred, categories were combined with adjacent categories until the minimum frequency count was met. The chi-

square test was used to determine whether significant differences existed at the .05 level of significance between the two survey results. If a significant chi-square value was found, the standardized residual was computed for each category to determine the major contributors of the statistical significance (Hinkle, Jurs, & Wiersma, 1988, p. 556). The null hypothesis that was established for the study was that there would be no significant difference between the frequencies in the 1979 study and the 1997 study. When the null hypothesis was rejected, the differences between the 1979 and 1997 data were due to more than sampling fluctuation, and the standardized residual was computed to find the major contributor(s) to the significant chi-square value.

Data Reporting

The frequencies and percentage distributions were tabulated from data received from the returned questionnaires and are reported in table format in chapter 4. The statistical results were compared with the statistics from the Simonds (1979) study. The research questions corresponded with the first eight sections of the College Leadership Training Programs Questionnaire. The comparative discussion that follows reveals similarities and differences in college student leadership training programs that have occurred in the past 2 decades, with implications for the student affairs professional.

CHAPTER IV

PRESENTATION OF FINDINGS

Introduction

This chapter presents the findings of this study and compares them to the findings of the Simonds (1979) study. Each of the research questions was addressed by comparing the data collected through the questionnaires with the data from the Simonds study. First, are more colleges and universities currently conducting student leadership training programs than in 1979? Second, how have the goals, purposes, and planning of these programs changed since 1979? Third, how does student, staff, and faculty involvement compare with the involvement in 1979? Fourth, are participants selected in the same manner as in 1979? Fifth, how has the content of the student leadership training programs changed since 1979? Sixth, what types of physical and financial arrangements are used in comparison to those used in 1979? Seventh, how do the methods currently being used in student leadership training compare to those used in 1979? And, eighth, what methods of evaluation are being used now in comparison to 1979?

Description of the Sample

A total of 365 questionnaires was mailed to the chief student life officer at 4-year colleges and universities in the United States. Sixty-four percent responded to the survey as compared to the 70 percent who responded in 1979. The 1979 and 1997

demographic findings were reported as a comparison of the two studies. The findings include responses by region, titles of respondents, institutional enrollment, institutional status, local environment, institution description, institutional gender status, and commuter population.

As was done in the Simonds (1979) study, the nation was divided into six regions: East, South, Great Lakes, Midwest, Northwest, and West. The East was composed of Maine, Vermont, New Hampshire, Massachusetts, Connecticut, Rhode Island, New York, New Jersey, and Pennsylvania. The South included Virginia, West Virginia, North Carolina, South Carolina, Georgia, Florida, Alabama, Mississippi, Arkansas, Texas, Louisiana, Delaware, Maryland, Tennessee, and Kentucky. The Great Lakes region included Ohio, Illinois, Indiana, Wisconsin, and Michigan. The Midwest region was comprised of Kansas, Oklahoma, Iowa, Missouri, Minnesota, North Dakota, South Dakota, and Nebraska. The Northwest region included Montana, Wyoming, Idaho, Oregon, and Washington. The final region, the West, was composed of California, New Mexico, Utah, Arizona, Nevada, Colorado, Alaska, and Hawaii. The number of questionnaires mailed to each region and the number of responses from both the 1997 and 1979 studies are reported in Table 1.

Table 1

Responses by Region

	1979			1997		
Region	Number mailed	Number responded	%	Number mailed	Number responded	%
East	77	52	66	103	70	68
South	87	62	70	110	64	58
Great Lakes	47	30	64	56	35	63
Midwest	37	31	84	49	31	63
Northwest	10	9	90	12	8	67
West	24	16	66	35	27	77
Total	284	200		365	235	

The South had the lowest rate of return in 1997 as compared to the Great Lakes region in 1979. The highest rate of return in 1997 was from the West, as compared to the Northwest in 1979.

Although the questionnaire was sent to the "chief student life officer" at the institution, that person was directed to " forward this questionnaire to the staff member who is in the best position to answer it." The titles of respondents were divided into the same four categories as used by the Simonds (1979) study -- vice presidents, deans, directors, assistant directors, and others. A description of the titles of respondents from 1997 and 1979 is provided in Table 2.

Table 2

Titles of Respondents

	1979		1997	
Title	*f*	%	*f*	%
Vice presidents	35	18	40	17
Deans	100	50	33	14
Directors	35	18	83	35
Assistant directors and others	20	10	77	33
Missing value	10	5	2	1
Total	200	100	235	100

The percentage of vice presidents responding to the questionnaire remained about the same, but there was a decrease in the number of deans responding and an increase in the number of responses from directors, assistant directors, and others. Assistant deans from many institutions responded to this questionnaire. It did not appear that this was the case in 1979.

The enrollment of the responding institutions appeared to represent the many sizes of institutions of higher education even though there were some difficulties in the reporting of enrollment. The differences occurred between the HEGIS and HEP figures used for the mailings and the figures reported by the respondents. The institutions were divided by full-time enrollment numbers, and the respondents were asked to report on undergraduate enrollment numbers. To eliminate some confusion, both the HEGIS and HEP percentages were reported in Table 3 rather than just the respondents' percentages for full-time equivalent student enrollment.

Table 3

Enrollment of Respondent Institutions

	1979				1997			
Enrollment	Number mailed	Responses	%	HEGIS %	Number mailed	Responses	%	HEP %
500-999	61	48	79	67	57	43	75	51
1,000-4,999	136	102	75	60	187	123	66	65
5,000-9,999	41	29	71	80	59	31	53	66
10,000-20,000	27	16	60	80	42	26	62	69
Over 20,000	17	5	30	30	20	10	50	80
Missing value	0	0			0	2		
Total	282	200			365	235		

The most noticeable difference was that only 30 percent (HEGIS) of the "over 20,000" responded in 1979 as compared to 80 percent (HEP) in 1997. According to the HEP figures, in all of the enrollment categories, over half of the institutions responded. This response rate demonstrates that the sample was representative of the total population and its enrollment categories.

The data reported in the next five tables deal with institutional descriptions. The data concerning the public or private status of the institutions are presented in Table 4.

Table 4

Status of Respondent Institutions

	1979		1997	
Status	*f*	%	*f*	%
Public	78	39	94	40
Private	122	61	138	59
Missing value	0	0	3	1
Total	200	100	235	100

Public institutions comprised 40 percent of the 1997 respondents. This is close to the 39 percent of public institutions that responded to the Simonds study. Private institutions made up 59 percent in 1997 and 61 percent in 1979.

In Table 5 the findings on the local environment are reported. Local environment includes urban, rural, and suburban. Urban environments are those within a city. Rural institutions are those that are located in the country, and suburban areas are those located on the outskirts of large cities.

Table 5

Local Environment of Respondent Institutions

	1979		1997	
Environment	*f*	%	*f*	%
Urban	80	40	79	34
Rural	64	32	73	31
Suburban	55	28	76	32
Missing value	1	1	7	3
Total	87	100	235	100

The local environment in 1997 was approximately one-third urban, one-third rural, and one-third suburban. The percentage of urban institutions responding to the questionnaire was 6 percent less than in 1979, and the percentage of suburban respondents was up by 4 percent.

Data used to describe the institutional status of the respondents are presented in Table 6. College refers to those institutions granting undergraduate degrees, university refers to those institutions granting undergraduate and graduate degrees.

Table 6

Institutional Description of Respondent Institutions

	1979		1997	
Institution	*f*	%	*f*	%
College	107	53	118	50
University	90	45	104	44
Other	3	2	13	6
Total	200	100	235	100

The institutional description has remained about the same. In 1997, of the institutions, 50 percent reported to be colleges and 44 percent were universities. In the 1979 study, 53 percent were colleges and 45 percent were reported to be universities.

In Table 7 the data pertaining to the gender status of the institutions responding to the survey are reported. Respondents were asked to choose between all male, all female, and coeducational.

Table 7

Gender Status of Respondent Institutions

	1979		1997	
Gender status	*f*	%	*f*	%
All male	2	1	1	0
All female	9	5	11	5
Co-educational	189	94	222	95
Missing value	0	0	1	0
Total	200	100	235	100

The gender status of the respondents in 1997 was basically the same as the 1979 percentages. Between 94 and 95 percent of respondents from both studies reported coeducational campuses.

Data relating to the percentage of commuters at the responding institutions are reported in Table 8. Commuter populations at U.S. institutions of higher education have grown over the years. This can be seen in the following table.

Table 8

Commuter Population of Respondent Institutions

	1979		1997	
Commuter population	*f*	%	*f*	%
None	5	3	11	5
Less than 25%	59	30	69	29
25-50%	50	25	41	17
50-75%	34	17	51	22
Over 75%	33	17	45	19
100%	18	9	13	6
Missing value	1	0	5	2
Total	200	100	235	100

The commuter profile of the 1997 respondent campuses differed from that of the 1979 respondents. There were 4 percent more campuses with a commuter population of 50 percent or more in the 1997 study than in 1979. Also, there were 7 percent fewer institutions in 1997 with a commuter population of 50 percent or less.

In summary, the profile of the institutions that responded to both studies represented the higher education system in the United States at the corresponding time. It is assumed that this study has provided an accurate picture of the leadership training programs in higher education today and an accurate comparison of the 1979 and 1997 studies.

Leadership Training Programs

Leadership training programs have been defined as "specifically designed programs which present leadership knowledge and skills to students" (Simonds, 1979, p. 33). Table 9 indicates the frequencies, chi-square analysis, and standardized residual for the length of time in which these programs have been in place.

Table 9

Chi-Square and Standardized Residual for Length of Time of Programs

	1979		1997		
Years	*f*	%	*f*	%	*R*
0 - 1	13	15	23	13	-.57
2 - 3	31	36	26	15	-4.57
4 - 6	27	31	39	22	-2.03
7 or more	14	16	79	45	9.63
Missing values	2	2	7	4	
Totals	87	100	174	100	118.12 = χ^{2*}

* significant at the .05 level

Seventy-four percent of the respondents had this type of program in place at their college or university. This was significantly different, χ^2 (1, N = 235) = 89.195, from the 1979 results, which reported only 44 percent of the colleges and universities as having a leadership training program. The Simonds (1979) study also reported that, of the institutions that did not have a leadership training program, 41 percent were planning to initiate a program. This helps to explain why 67 percent of the current programs have been at these institutions for 4 or more years.

Of the institutions that did not have programs, 66 percent had plans for initiating a leadership training program. This is significantly higher, χ^2 (1, N = 61) = 15.516, than the

41 percent that had plans for initiating a program in 1979. Also, 23 percent of the 1979 and 1997 respondents that did not have a program had had a program in the past 10 years. Eighty-five percent of the 1979 respondents and 89 percent of the 1997 respondents without a program also reported that knowledge of programs at other colleges would be of value in initiating or reinstating a program at their college.

In summary, significantly more colleges and universities had leadership training programs in place in 1997 than in 1979. Well over half of these institutions had had their program in place for over 4 years, and over half of the institutions without a program had plans to initiate one.

Purposes and Goals of Leadership Training Programs

Findings concerning the purposes and goals of leadership training programs are presented in this section. Purposes deal with the end results of the programs, while the goals provided ways for the purpose to be achieved. The top three purposes of 1979 and 1997 are presented in Table 10.

Table 10

Purposes of Leadership Training Programs

Importance	1979	1997
First	To develop effective leadership skills.	To increase student involvement in extracurriculum.
Second	To develop an additional educational component for the student activities program.	To identify potential leaders early.
Third	To promote smooth transitions from year to year with student organizations.	To develop an additional educational component for the student activities program.

In 1979 the most important purpose of leadership training programs was to develop effective leadership skills. The second most important purpose was to develop an additional educational component for the student activities program, and the third most important purpose was to promote smooth transitions from year to year within student organizations. The 1997 responses found increasing student involvement in extracurriculum the most important, identifying potential leaders early as the second most important, and developing an additional educational component for the student activities program as the third most important purpose for establishing a leadership training program. Because insufficient data were provided by the Simonds (1979) study, no statistical comparison of the purposes was possible.

The most important goal of leadership training programs identified by the Simonds (1979) study and the 1997 study was to increase effective leadership. The second most important goal of both studies was to increase students' knowledge of their own leadership qualities. Again, insufficient data were available to compare the results statistically.

In summary, the 1997 respondents differentiated between the purposes and the goals of leadership training programs. They saw the purpose more broadly and the goals as the way to achieve those purposes. The differences from 1979 to 1997 may be due to the changes in the way people think about purposes and goals.

Student, Staff, and Faculty Involvement in Leadership Training Programs

Involvement in the initiating, planning, and implementing of leadership training programs is crucial to the success of the programs. Chi-square analysis and standardized

residuals for the 1979 and 1997 findings concerning the initiators of leadership training programs are reported in Table 11.

Table 11

Chi-Square and Standardized Residual for Initiators of Leadership Training Programs

	1979		1997		
Category	*f*	%	*f*	%	*R*
Students	4	5	6	3	-.71
Staff	29	33	65	37	.93
Student/staff committee	16	18	30	17	-.33
Staff with interest	36	41	59	34	-1.54
Other	2	2	14	8	5.00
Total	87	100	174	100	28.805 = χ^{2*}

* significant at the .05 level

The 1997 study found that most student leadership training programs continue to be initiated by staff members. This result was found to be consistent with the Breen (1970), Wright (1967), and Simonds (1979) studies. Although the 1997 results were found to be significantly different from the 1979 results, the contributing factor was the category labeled other.

The office with the final responsibility for presenting a leadership training program varied from campus to campus and from 1979 to 1997. The chi-square analysis and standardized residuals of the 1979 and 1997 results in this area are presented in Table 12.

Table 12

Chi-Square and Standardized Residual for Office with Final Responsibility

	1979		1997		
Office	*f*	%	*f*	%	*R*
Dean of students	47	54	58	33	-3.71
Student activities	22	25	80	46	5.42
Student government	1	1	6	3	2.95
Counseling	5	6	1	1	-2.83
Academic department	7	8	2	1	-3.19
Other	5	6	27	16	5.42
Total	87	100	174	100	99.536 = χ^{2*}

* significant at the .05 level

Final responsibility for leadership training fell to the student activities department in 1997 as compared to falling to the dean of students office in 1979. The changes were found to be significantly different, with the changes in student activities and other being the highest contributing factors to the change.

Although final responsibility appeared to fall to a particular office, the offices that participated in the planning and implementation varied. It appeared that a combination of offices participated in the planning of leadership training programs. The differences in frequency and percentage distribution can be seen in Table 13.

Table 13

Frequency and Percentage Distribution for Offices Planning and Implementing

	1979		1997	
Office	*f*	%	*f*	%
Dean of students	69	79	100	58
Student activities	61	70	149	86
Student government	56	64	95	55
Counseling	22	25	35	20
Academic department	15	17	42	24
Other	7	8	76	44

Note: 1979 results do not total 87 cases or 100 percent, and 1997 results do not total 174 cases or 100 percent because of multiple answers.

The offices most often involved in the planning and implementing of leadership training programs were student activities, dean of students, and student government. Counseling and academic departments continued to have the least amount of involvement in this phase of leadership training.

The Simonds (1979) study reported that 75 percent of the respondents had one staff member responsible for the leadership training programs. The 1997 results showed that 72 percent had one staff member with primary responsibility. The percentage of time this staff member devoted to the leadership training program is shown in Table 14.

Table 14

Chi-Square and Standardized Residual of Staff Member's Time

	1979		1997		
Category	*f*	%	*f*	%	*R*
Less than 25%	53	80	72	57	-2.90
25% - 50%	11	17	32	25	2.39
51% - 75%	1	2	13	10	8.08
Greater than 75%	1	2	9	7	5.17
Total	66	100	126	100	106.176 = χ^{2}*

* significant at the .05 level

All of the categories were major contributors to the significant difference that was found from 1979 to 1997. The percentage of time the staff member devoted to leadership grew significantly. While 80 percent spent less than 25 percent of their time on leadership training programs in 1979, 57 percent reported the same in 1997. More staff members were reported as spending over 50 percent of their time on leadership training programs than in 1979.

When asked if the program would continue at the present level if that staff member were to leave, there was no significant difference, χ^2 (1, $\underline{N}$ = 126) = 3.276. Seventy-three percent reported in 1979 that the program would continue, whereas 80 percent said in 1997 that the program would continue. Forty-eight percent of the respondents reported an increased commitment to leadership training programs through increases in staffing since 1980.

Although staff members continue to be the primary instructors of leadership programs, there has been a change in the use of student, faculty, and outside consultants

as instructors. The distribution of instructors used at leadership training programs is presented in Table 15.

Table 15

Frequency and Percentage Distribution of Instructors

	1979		1997	
Group	*N*	%	*N*	%
Students	26	30	95	55
Staff	78	90	159	91
Faculty	28	32	112	64
Outside consultants	24	28	93	53
Other	4	5	10	6

Note: 1979 results do not total 87 cases or 100 percent, and 1997 results do not total 174 cases or 100 percent because of multiple answers.

There was an increase in all categories of instructors from 1979 to 1997. The greatest percentage increase was found in the faculty category. Thirty-two percent more faculty members served as instructors of leadership training programs in 1997, and there was a 25 percent increase in both students and outside consultants as instructors. There was only a 1 percent increase in staff members as instructors.

The next consideration was the qualifications for instructors. Academic degree, experience, training, personal interest, knowledge of students, and professional reputation are all qualifications examined in this study. Data on instructor qualifications are reported in Table 16.

Table 16

Chi-Square and Standardized Residual for Instructor Qualifications

	1979		1997		
Category	*f*	%	*f*	%	*R*
Academic degree	3	3	3	2	-1.20
Experience	58	67	112	64	-0.38
Training	1	1	2	1	.06
Personal interest	19	22	32	18	-.96
Knowledge of students	4	5	14	8	2.12
Professional reputation and other	2	2	11	6	3.50
Total	87	100	174	100	19.239 = χ^{2*}

* significant at the .05 level

The two most important instructor qualifications -- experience and personal interest -- for the 1979 study also emerged as the two most important for the 1997 study. The notable differences were the increases in the percentages of respondents who felt that knowledge of students and professional reputation were important.

For both studies, the initiators of leadership training programs were predominantly staff, with the student activities and dean of students offices having final responsibility for these programs. These two offices also participated in the planning and implementation of the programs, although over half of the respondents reported assistance from student government. The percentage of the staff member's time that was devoted to the leadership training programs was significantly higher in 1997 than in the 1979 study. Students, faculty, and outside consultants were being used as instructors more in 1997 with the instructor qualifications of knowledge of students and professional reputation being significantly higher.

Participant Selection in Leadership Training Programs

The Simonds (1979) study did not present the data concerning the selection of student participants, the criteria for selecting participants, or the most important methods for interesting students in leadership training programs. According to the 1997 study, most programs invited all students to participate, and staff established the criteria for the selection of participants. The most important method for interesting students in leadership training programs was to promote the intrinsic value of knowledge and skills that would be gained during the program. The second and third most important methods for interesting students were suggesting use in future careers and requiring students in certain positions to attend.

In both studies, the majority of respondents reported that there was one leadership training program available to all groups on campus, and no significant change, χ^2 (1, $\underline{N}$ = 174) = 1.291, was reported from 1979 to 1997. In the 1979 study, 56 percent reported a program available to all student organizations. Fifty-two percent reported the same in 1997. There was a significant change, χ^2 (1, $\underline{N}$ = 172) = 26.242, in the percentage of programs given for individual organizations. Sixty-seven percent in 1979 and 85 percent in 1997 reported leadership training programs given for individual student organizations.

Data reported in Table 17 represent the frequency and percentage of officers attending leadership training programs. Because of the greater then 75% category being combined with missing values to calculate the chi-square value, it is not possible to statistically compare the 1997 results with the 1979 findings.

Table 17

Percentage of Student Organization Officers Attending

	1979		1997		
Percentage	*f*	%	*f*	%	
Less than 10%	15	17	28	16	
10% - 25%	21	24	39	22	
26% - 50%	18	21	45	26	
51% - 75%	17	20	26	15	
Greater than 75%/missing value	16	18	36	21	
Total	87	100	174	100	$4.145 = \chi^{2*}$

Note: Five cases from 1997 did not provide valid answers.
* not significant at the .05 level

Of the students attending these training programs, there was no change in the percentage of student officers attending. In 60 percent of the 1997 responses, 26 to 50 percent of the participants were male, and 80 percent made no special efforts to equalize the number of male and female participants in their program.

Over half of the institutions in both studies reported that at least one leadership training program was available to all students. More programs were being given for individual organizations in 1997, and the percentage of student officers attending the programs did not significantly change from 1979 to 1997.

Content of Leadership Training Programs

The content of leadership training programs includes emphasis, topics, concepts, and materials. The emphasis of the programs could include effective leadership characteristics, leadership behaviors, leader-member interactions, situational variables, and other. The chi-square analysis and standardized residuals of the emphasis of the programs can be found in Table 18.

Table 18

Chi-Square and Standardized Residual of Emphasis

	1979		1997		
Category	*f*	%	*f*	%	*R*
Effective leadership characteristics	14	16	39	22	2.08
Leadership behaviors	33	38	54	31	-1.47
Leader-member interaction	18	21	39	22	.50
Situational variables	8	9	24	14	2.00
Other	13	15	14	8	-2.34
Missing value	1	1	4	2	1.71
Total	87	100	174	100	19.131 = χ^{2*}

* significant at the .05 level

From 1979 to 1997, the emphasis placed in the leadership training programs changed significantly. The 1997 results found a significantly lower emphasis placed on the other category and a significantly higher emphasis placed on effective leadership characteristics. Situational variables were on the verge of being significantly higher.

Although the five most important topics emphasized in leadership training programs were not fully reported in the Simonds (1979) study, some similarities can be identified. The most important topics for both studies were communication skills, organizational development, and interpersonal relationships. This study also produced several other important topics, including decision making, conflict resolution, and cross-cultural skills. In 1979, Simonds reported that "the topic of cross-cultural skills was not a topic that was frequently discussed in these programs" (p. 45). As was reported in the Simonds study, the respondents in 1997 also minimumly reported sensitivity training as an important topic. This follows Simonds's conclusion that "sensitivity training has fallen out of favor" (p.45).

Leadership training programs from 1979 and 1997 incorporated many concepts or materials into their programs. The more popular concepts of 1979 are no longer as popular and have been replaced by more recently developed concepts. The frequency and percentage distribution of these concepts are reported in Table 19. It should be noted that several concepts that were not included in the Simonds study were added to the 1997 study. These concepts and materials have been more recently developed and are incorporated into the discussion of the findings in chapter 4.

Table 19

Frequency and Percentage Distribution of Incorporated Concepts and Materials

	1979		1997	
Concepts	*f*	%	*f*	%
Management by objectives	43	49	32	18
Transactional analysis	13	15	9	5
T-P questionnaire	23	26	19	11
University Associates' structured experiences	45	52	48	28
Personal problems affecting job performance	32	37	20	12
Total quality management			44	25
Co-Curricular transcripts			48	28
Community service/service learning			94	54
Myers-Briggs Type Indicator or similar			108	62
Low/high adventure experiences			74	43
Gender issues			89	51
Multicultural issues			121	70
Covey concepts			72	41
Mentoring			72	41
Other	12	14	24	14

Note: 1979 results do not total 87 cases or 100 percent, and 1997 results do not total 174 cases or 100 percent because of multiple answers. The 1979 concepts with no values were not included in the Simonds study. They were added to the 1997 study to provide more current information.

There was a decrease in the percentage of respondents using all of the concepts cited in the 1979 study. Concepts that were reported as being used by over 50 percent of the 1997 respondents included community service/service learning, Myers-Briggs Type Indicator or similar, gender issues, and multicultural issues. Low/high adventure experiences, Covey concepts, and mentoring were also utilized by over 40 percent.

Physical and Financial Arrangements of Leadership Training Programs

The average number of leadership training programs was 8 in 1997, as compared to 6 in 1979. The highest number of programs at one institution was 18 in 1979 and 62 in 1997. Over three quarters of the respondents had 6 or fewer programs per year in 1979. In the 1997study, 52 institutions, or 32 percent, reported 6 or fewer programs. The typical length of the leadership training program was a weekend or less in both the 1979 study (54%) and the 1997 study (59%).

Leadership programs were conducted on-campus, off-campus, or were a combination of on- and off-campus. The changes in location from 1979 to 1997 were significantly different. The findings are reported in Table 20.

Table 20

Chi-Square and Standardized Residual of Location

	1979		1997		
Location	*f*	%	*f*	%	*R*
On-campus	38	44	66	38	-1.15
Off-campus	12	14	13	8	-2.25
Both	37	43	95	55	2.45
Total	87	100	174	100	12.367 = χ^{2*}

* significant at the .05 level

These findings show fewer off-campus programs and more respondents using both on- and off-campus facilities. Programs that were conducted on-campus in the 1997 study most frequently used the student center, seminar rooms, and classrooms. Off-campus programs in 1997 were most likely to be conducted at an outdoor camping facility or conference center. The Simonds (1979) study did not present this information.

The 1970 Breen study reported that over half the good leadership training programs cost between $1,000 and $10,000. The Simonds (1979) study found a significantly lower amount of funding than did the Breen study. The comparison between the Simonds study and the 1997 study can be found in Table 21.

Table 21

Chi-Square and Standardized Residual of Levels of Funding

	1979		1997		
Level	*f*	%	*f*	%	*R*
None	17	20	11	6	-3.94
Under $500	34	39	16	9	-6.30
$500 - $1,000	17	20	28	16	-1.02
$1,001 - $3,000	14	16	35	20	1.32
Over $3,000	4	5	82	47	22.15
Missing value	1	1	2	1	.20
Total	87	100	174	100	548.447 = χ^{2}*

* significant at the .05 level

Seventy-nine percent of the programs in the Simonds study cost less than $1,000, as compared to 31 percent in 1997. The 1997 study found that 67 percent of the programs cost more than $1,000, as compared to 21 percent in 1979. The significant difference can be attributed to the decrease in the percentage of institutions that had no

funding, or under $500 funding, and an increase in the percentage of those that spent over $3,000 annually on leadership training programs.

The three main sources of funding for the leadership training programs remained the same. They are a combination of funds (1979 = 41%; 1997 = 45%), university or college budget (1979 = 33%; 1997 = 31%), and student activities funds (1979 = 17%; 1997 = 14%). Since 1980, of the respondents, 44 percent reported an increase in commitment through the funding of leadership development programs.

The average number of participants for leadership training programs grew significantly from 1979 to 1997. These findings are shown in Table 22.

Table 22

Chi-Square and Standardized Residual for Average Number of Participants

	1979		1997		
Average number	*f*	%	*f*	%	*R*
Under 10	2	2	3	2	-.50
10 - 20	23	26	36	21	-1.47
21 - 40	42	48	76	44	-.88
41 - 60	13	15	30	17	.80
Over 60	2	2	27	16	11.50
Missing values	5	6	2	1	-2.61
	87	100	174	100	142.794 = χ^{2*}

* significant at the .05 level

The greatest change was in the number of programs averaging over 60 participants. The other groups remained significantly the same. In 45 percent of the cases in the 1997 study, no priority was given as to who could attend the leadership training programs. Also, in 77 percent of the cases, no priority was given to the classification of the participants. Although generally no priority was given as to who could attend these

programs, 28 percent reported that their institution did have advanced leadership training programs that complemented the basic-level programs.

In summary, the average number of programs rose from six in 1979 to eight in 1997. The typical length for the leadership training programs remained a weekend or less. More institutions used both on- and off-campus facilities. In 1979, over three quarters of the programs cost $1,000 or less. In 1997, over half the programs cost more than $1,000. The sources of funding did not significantly change. The average size of the programs significantly changed in 1997, with more institutions having over 60 attendees.

Methodology of Leadership Training Programs

Instructional methods included lecture, experiential, sensitivity training, and other. The lecture method is defined as the instructor's presentation of concepts of leadership and examples of good leadership. Group discussion and question and answer periods can be used. In experiential training, participants learn skills and knowledge of leadership through use of structured exercises. Feelings are discussed only to the extent that they help explain behavior. Sensitivity training includes participants discussing their feelings about sensitive topics that affect their leadership behavior. Chi-square data relating to instructional methods are reported in Table 23.

Table 23

Chi-Square for Instructional Methods

	1979		1997		
Methods	*f*	%	*f*	%	
Lecture	15	17	38	22	
Experiential	66	76	124	71	
Sensitivity and other	4	5	9	5	
Missing values	2	2	3	2	
Total	87	100	174	100	$2.860 = \chi^{2*}$

* not significant at the .05 level

The instructional methods most characteristic of the programs remained statistically similar. The experiential method was used over 70 percent of the time in both studies. The two most important methods used to transmit the knowledge and skills of leadership in training programs in both 1979 and 1997 were small-group discussions and problem solving.

The percentage of programs using the National Training Laboratory (NTL) sensitivity methods continued to decline. In the 1970 Breen study, 75 percent of the programs used this method. The Simonds study in 1979 reported only 14 percent, and the 1997 study reported only 3 percent. Of the 3 percent that used the NTL methods, 40 percent used them because of the reputation of the materials.

Table 24 represents the frequency and percentage distribution of the types of audiovisual equipment used for programs in the 1979 and 1997 studies. Although the only categories specified were the videotape, tape recorder, and films, the other category provided more information concerning additional aids that were being used in leadership training.

Table 24

Frequency and Percentage Distribution for Audiovisual Aids

	1979		1997	
AV Aid	*f*	%	*f*	%
Videotape	22	25	117	67
Tape recorder	27	31	39	22
Films	25	29	40	23
Other	8	9	29	17

Note: 1979 results do not total 87 cases or 100 percent, and 1997 results do not total 174 cases or 100 percent because of multiple answers.

The videotape gained popularity, probably due to the increase in its availability and decrease in cost. The tape recorder and films decreased in popularity, whereas the category labeled as other increased. The respondents specified the types of other audiovisual aids being used as overhead projectors, flip charts, computers, handouts, slides, posters, and compact disc players.

In summary, the two most important methods used in leadership training programs -- small group discussions and problem solving -- remained the same from 1979 to 1997. Videotape players increased in popularity as an audiovisual aid. Computers and compact disc players were introduced as aids in the 1997 study.

Evaluation of Leadership Training Programs

The questions concerning the evaluation of leadership training programs included self-evaluations, important accomplishments, types of evaluations, initiators of evaluations, and processes for documenting improvement. Data relating to self-evaluations are presented in Table 25.

Table 25

Chi-Square and Standardized Residual for Self-Evaluations

	1979		1997		
Rating	*f*	%	*f*	%	*R*
Highly successful	11	13	29	17	1.51
Successful	52	60	84	48	-1.97
Average	20	23	43	25	.47
Fair	2	2	9	5	2.50
Poor	1	1	3	2	.78
Missing values	1	1	6	3	3.23
Total	87	100	174	100	23.658 = χ^{2*}

* significant at the .05 level

The respondents' self-evaluations of the leadership training programs revealed that 73 percent in 1979 and 65 percent in 1997 were successful or highly successful. The significant change was that 5 percent of the 1997 respondents felt that their program was fair, as opposed to 2 percent in 1979. The percentage of those feeling their program was poor also increased, but not significantly.

The respondents were asked to rank the three most important accomplishments of their leadership training programs. The most important accomplishment, as reported in 1979 and 1997, was development of effective leadership skills. The second most important accomplishment in 1979 was the promotion of a smooth transition from year to year in student organizations. The improvement of relations between groups was ranked as the second most important accomplishment in the 1997 study and the third most important in the 1979 study. The early identification of potential leaders was ranked as the third most important accomplishment in 1997.

The Simonds study found that the majority of programs were evaluated. The 1997 study agreed with 86 percent reporting that the leadership training programs were evaluated. These evaluations occurred in a variety of ways. Written evaluations were the prominent method used in 1979 (61 %) and 1997 (71 %). Of the programs that were evaluated, 77 percent in 1979 and 74 percent in 1997 did so immediately following the program.

Staff members continued to take the lead in the evaluation of the programs. Table 26 presents the chi-square analysis and standardized residuals pertaining to the evaluators of leadership training programs.

Table 26

Chi-Square and Standardized Residual of Evaluators

	1979		1997		
Group	*f*	%	*f*	%	*R*
Students	21	24	41	24	-.14
Staff	33	38	64	37	-.24
Student-staff committee	14	16	25	14	-.57
Staff member with interest	16	18	17	10	-2.65
Other	1	1	8	5	4.40
Missing values	2	2	19	11	8.32
Total	87	100	174	100	$96.013 = \chi^{2*}$

* significant at the .05 level

The significant changes were seen in a decrease in the percentage of staff members with a special interest in leadership's evaluating programs and an increase in the percentage of others evaluating. Respondents specified other groups as program facilitators and off-campus leaders in civic, nonprofit, and business areas.

The types of processes used for documenting improved leadership training included none, observations, feelings and impressions, surveys, pre- and posttests, and other. Table 27 details the frequency and percentage distributions of the documentation processes.

Table 27

Frequency and Percentage Distribution of Documentation Processes

	1979		1997	
Process	*f*	%	*f*	%
None	24	28	46	26
Observations	51	59	97	56
Feelings and impressions	49	56	100	58
Surveys	6	7	25	14
Pre- and post-tests	4	5	12	7
Other	1	1	5	3

Note: 1979 results do not total 87 cases or 100 percent, and 1997 results do not total 174 cases or 100 percent because of multiple answers.

The process for documenting improved leadership of programs in 1997 was about the same as was reported in 1979. Observations, as well as feelings and impressions, continued to be the two major methods of documentation of improved leadership. The major change was that the percentage of programs using survey techniques doubled from 1979 (7 %) to 1997 (14 %). Pre- and posttest techniques continued to be utilized less than other methods, and 26 percent of the 1997 respondents had no documentation process, as compared to the 28 percent in 1979.

In summary, the 1997 respondents did not rate their programs as high as did the 1979 respondents. The most important accomplishment of the leadership training programs was reported to be the development of effective leadership skills in both 1979

and 1997. Also, both studies reported that the programs documented success through observations, feelings, and impressions. Over one quarter of both studies reported no documentation process.

Summary of Findings

College leadership training program questionnaires were sent to the chief student life officers at colleges and universities across the United States. Sixty-four percent (235) of 365 questionnaires were returned. The responses provided a representative sample of the total population in respect to region of the country, title of respondents, institutional enrollment, institutional status, local environment, institution description, institutional gender status, and commuter population.

Significantly more colleges and universities had leadership training programs in place in 1997 than in 1979. Of those colleges and universities that responded, 74 percent had leadership training programs. Forty-five percent of these programs had been in place for 7 or more years. Of the institutions that did not have programs, 66 percent had plans for initiating one.

The most important purposes of the leadership training programs were to increase student involvement in extracurriculum, to identify potential leaders early, and to develop an additional educational component for the student activities program. The most important goals were to increase effective leadership and to increase students' knowledge of their own leadership qualities.

Staff members initiated 71 percent of the programs. The final responsibility, the planning, and the implementing of leadership training programs fell to the student activities

office. Seventy-five percent of the respondents had one staff member responsible for the programs. It was also reported that leadership training programs would continue at 80 percent of the institutions even if the staff member in charge were to leave.

The primary instructors of leadership training programs were staff members. There were 25 percent more institutions using students and outside consultants as instructors, and 32 percent more using faculty members. The most important qualifications for instructors were experience and personal interest.

Fifty-two percent of the programs invited all students to participate in at least one leadership training program. The most important methods for interesting students in the programs were promoting the intrinsic value of knowledge and skills that would be gained during the program, suggesting use in future careers, and requiring students in certain positions to attend. There was no significant change in the percentage of student organization officers attending the programs.

The most important topics were communication skills, organizational development, interpersonal relationships, decision making, conflict resolution, and cross-cultural skills. Many concepts and materials are used by leadership training programs. Those most frequently reported were multicultural issues, the Myers-Briggs Type Indicator, community service/service learning, gender issues, low-high adventure experiences, Covey concepts, and mentoring.

The average number of leadership training programs was 8 with the most at one institution being 62. Seventy-seven percent of the programs averaged over 20 participants. Fifty-nine percent reported that the typical length of the program was one

weekend or less. Over half of the programs used both on- and off-campus facilities. Forty-seven percent of the leadership training programs cost over $3,000. A combination of funds, university or college budget, and student activities budget were the top sources of appropriations.

The two most important methods used to transmit knowledge and skills were small-group discussions and problem solving. Experiential methods were used 71 percent of the time. Lecture methods were used only 22 percent of the time. The videotape was the audiovisual aid that was used most frequently. Other aids mentioned were overhead projectors, flip charts, computers, and compact disc players.

The respondents reported that the three most important accomplishments of their programs were the development of effective leadership skills, the improvement of relations between groups, and the early identification of potential leaders. Staff members took the lead in the evaluation process. Eighty-six percent of the respondents reported that their leadership training programs were being evaluated. The written evaluation was the most prominent method used.

CHAPTER V

SUMMARY, DISCUSSION, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Summary

This study was designed to produce a description of the most common practices of current leadership training programs at four-year degree granting institutions of higher education and to compare the 1979 and 1997 findings by replicating the Simonds (1979) study. The questionnaire used in this study was developed by Simonds for his study. The selection of the sample followed the Simonds study selection. Four-year undergraduate colleges and universities were selected in a systematic, random manner.

Data were analyzed both descriptively and statistically. Descriptive comparisons between the Simonds study and this study were made using frequency and percentage distribution tables. Chi-square goodness-of-fit tests were used when dealing with nominal data. These chi-square tests were used to determine if significant differences existed at the .05 level of significance between the 1979 and 1997 survey results.

Student Leadership Training Programs

The 1997 study found that 74 percent of the colleges and universities responding to the survey conducted student leadership training programs. This is 30 percent higher than the 1979 findings. Sixty-seven percent of the 1997 respondents had had their program for 4 or more years. Simonds (1979) reported that, of the 1979 respondents who did not have a leadership training program, 41 percent were planning a program.

Apparently, programs have been initiated at more colleges and universities since the 1979 study. According to the 1997 study, the number of colleges and universities with leadership training programs will continue to grow. Sixty-six percent of the institutions without a program have plans to initiate one.

The past and potential growth in the number of colleges and universities with leadership training programs confirm that colleges and universities have seen the importance of preparing college students for leadership roles. There has also been increased interest in leadership training by national professional student affairs associations such as the Association of College Unions - International (ACU-I), the National Association of Campus Activities (NACA), the National Association of Student Personnel Administrators (NASPA), and the Association for College Personnel Administrators (ACPA). Because of reasons discussed in the next section, student affairs personnel have taken on the responsibility for preparing college students for leadership positions.

Changes in Goals, Purposes, and Planning

The two most important goals of leadership training programs were reported by both studies as (a) increasing effective leadership and (b) increasing students' knowledge of their own leadership qualities. Because there was no change in the most important goals, it is ascertained that teaching leadership skills and providing opportunities for students to practice these skills and unveil their own leadership qualities are fairly steadfast goals in college student leadership training programs. Bennis (1989) stated, "Leadership courses can only teach skills. They can't teach character or vision -- and indeed they don't even try. Developing character and vision is the way leaders invent themselves" (p. 42).

By providing leadership opportunities in which students can immerse themselves and use the skills they have learned, the students can invent themselves.

Although two of the most important purposes of leadership training programs have changed, one was reported in both studies. Both studies reported developing an additional educational component for the student activities program. As was stated in the Simonds (1979) study, the purpose of developing an additional educational component for the student activities program "was written as an oblique reference to the student development model" (pp. 36-37). The continuance of the importance of this purpose demonstrates that student development practitioners are still concerned with the development of the "whole student" (Brown, 1972, p. 8). Boyer (1987) came to the conclusion that many institutions of higher education have lost their sense of purpose in producing leaders for our society. Students are encouraged to pursue specialty degrees, but are not taught how to relate what they learn to their lives, how to be leaders in their careers or communities, or how to integrate their classroom knowledge with their extracurricular experiences.

Simonds noted in his study that the 1979 findings on goals and purposes were seen as "practical and immediate concerns" (p. 37). The 1997 findings include a longer-term purpose. While increasing student involvement and developing an additional educational component for the student activities program are more practical and immediate concerns, identifying potential leaders appears to be more long-term, with plans for developing these students over their entire college career and preparing them for their lives after college.

Although there was a significant change in the initiators of student leadership training programs, the major contributor to these changes was the category identified as other. The majority of the respondents of this category reported involvement in the planning process by a combination of students, staff, and faculty. Although there is more involvement by faculty, the majority of the programs are still initiated by staff. Staff take the initiative in planning for student successes, with student input and assistance. According to Simonds (1979) and Greger (1959), many students do not realize the need for leadership training; therefore, it is important for staff and faculty to assess their students so that effective programs can be planned.

Sixty-nine percent of the 1997 respondents reported that they had ways of identifying student needs. The major ways of identification were reported as informal discussions, written questionnaires, and structured discussions. There continues to be a lack of scientific basis for deciding what is presented in leadership training programs, but some type of needs assessment is taking place.

Leadership inventories have been developed in recent years, but they are not being used by many colleges and universities in their leadership programs. The Student Leadership Practices Inventory (Student-LPI), developed by Posner and Brodsky, is one such inventory designed to assess and develop leadership in college students. If it is "used as prework for university leadership development programs, student leadership conferences, team building sessions, and the like, the Student-LPI would facilitate participant interest" (Posner & Brodsky, 1994, p. 119). In training and development, this inventory provides a personalized reference point for students and prepares them for

leadership roles and responsibilities. For initiators of college student leadership training programs, it serves as a method for assessing students so that programs can be planned better to meet their needs.

Staff who plan leadership training programs are filling a void in higher education programs that continually become more specialized and farther from the liberal arts. Although faculty are not the initiators of the programs, staff are seeing the need for faculty involvement. The initiators of the programs acknowledge the need to prepare students for leadership roles, but they often do not go about it through the use of scientific methods.

Student, Staff, and Faculty Involvement

As was stated in the previous sections, staff members continue to be the primary persons involved in college student leadership training programs. Although there continued to be one staff member with primary responsibility of leadership training, there was an increase in the percentage of time that that person devotes to training. Forty-eight percent of the 1997 respondents reported an increase in staffing commitment for leadership training programs, and the programs would continue if the person presently in that position were to leave.

Student involvement appears to be higher overall. More students are involved in the actual training process through their active participation as instructors. It can also be assumed that students are highly involved in the planning and implementation process through the office of student activities -- an office that usually has high student input and student employment.

Faculty, along with outside consultants, seem to be more involved in the actual training of students than they were in the past. The percentage of faculty instructors has doubled since 1979, and the percentage of outside consultants used as instructors has almost doubled. Academic departments are also more involved in the planning and implementing of programs. This follows Burns's (1995) conclusion that, "because of society's tremendous need for specialists who are also skilled leaders, now may be the perfect time on many college campuses for student affairs administrators to collaborate with faculty members in developing comprehensive interdisciplinary leadership studies programs" (p. 250). Although Burns mentions interdisciplinary programs in particular, this also applies to those programs that are not curriculum based. According to Burns, most professors do not see their role as preparing leaders but as transmitting knowledge in their particular field. It is important for faculty to be more involved with students because, according to Astin (1993), student-faculty interaction is one of the positive influences of leadership in college students (p. 137). It is also important for faculty to help students integrate leadership knowledge and discipline-based knowledge so that students will succeed in their future careers.

Because of the interdisciplinary nature of leadership training, it is important to have a variety of people involved in the planning, implementation, and instruction of these programs. Students should be prepared to be leaders in college, career, and community. For this reason, instructors with a variety of specializations, including faculty, staff, and outside consultants, can present more aspects of the diverse topics of leadership. The Jepson School of Leadership Studies at the University of Richmond has done this. Faculty

have expertise in such areas as legal studies, management, philosophy, government, industrial/organizational psychology, sociology, education, English, public administration, and economics. Although this is a degree program, it could be incorporated into leadership training programs based in student affairs.

Selection Procedures

As was mentioned in the previous chapter, Simonds (1979) did not report complete data concerning participant selection. What is known is that the majority of programs in 1997 were open to all groups. The percentage of programs presented to individual organizations grew from 67 percent in 1979 to 85 percent in 1997. This could be due to the increase in staff commitment, the percentage of staff members' time spent on leadership training, and the number of students presenting programs. It is important to note that the availability of leadership training programs greatly impacts college students. With more programs available, more students have the opportunity to be exposed to leadership training programs.

Changes in Content

Although significant changes were found, the three major emphases placed in college and university leadership training programs remained the same -- leadership behaviors, leader-member interaction, and effective leadership characteristics. Situational variables were on the verge of being significantly higher in 1997 than in the Simonds study.

In both studies, communication skills, organizational development, and interpersonal relationships were reported as being important topics to be emphasized in

leadership training programs. Although these topics were found to be important in both studies, several other topics emerged as important in the 1997 study. The Simonds study reported that cross-cultural skills were not found to be important, but this topic was found to be important in the 1997 study. This goes along with the emergence of multicultural programs, services, and training at institutions of higher education that has occurred in the past 2 decades. Also found to be important were decision-making skills and conflict resolution.

Newer leadership concepts have taken over older concepts. More recently accepted concepts, including community service/service learning, the Myers-Briggs Type Indicator, gender issues, and multicultural issues, were incorporated by over half of the responding institutions in 1997. Again, the emergence of multiculturalism, or cross-culturalism, shows the importance of this area of study in leadership training. Also, community service and service learning have appeared in many U.S. colleges and universities. Some schools have made service learning a part of degree requirements, while others have incorporated community service into voluntary programs within student affairs programs. According to Roberts and Ullom (1989, p. 71), community service allows students to meet community needs while learning more about themselves. In turn, this knowledge of themselves is integrated into their leadership style.

> By incorporating community service and leadership development for all students involved in campus activities, students will have the opportunity to challenge the traditional assumptions often made by leadership. Also, they will be better prepared to address the difficult issues of leadership and responsibility in their

careers, families, and communities during and after their college experience. (Delve & Rice, 1990, p. 57)

The MBTI can help students understand themselves and their behaviors, appreciate the differences in people and in how they approach different problems and situations, and serve as a building block for personal and leadership development (Provost & Anchors, 1987, pp. 27-28). Gender issues in leadership development have been studied numerous times. Posner and Brodsky's (1994) review of literature and studies in this area conclude that "gender fails to account for differences between the leadership behaviors of men and women" (p. 114). It proves interesting that this topic, with its fairly current research, is an important topic in college student leadership training programs even though gender does not appear to influence leadership.

Also found important were low/high adventure experiences, Covey concepts, and mentoring. Ropes courses have been built across the country. All types of groups, not just college and university students, go through these experiential courses to promote team building within their organizations. This relates to the importance placed on leader-member interaction. In order for a leader to be successful, he or she must effectively interact -- trust, communicate, make decisions, resolve conflict, develop organizations, relate interpersonally -- with others. According to Bradley and Brown (1989), this integrated approach to leadership training through low adventure experiences is influenced by theory-based strategies, the influence of the advisor, environmental effects, and strategies for skills development (p. 48).

"Transformative leadership achieves significant change that reflects the community of interests of both leaders and followers; indeed, it frees up and pools the collective energies in pursuit of a common goal" (Bennis & Nanus, 1985, p. 217). Covey's (1991) concept of principle-centered leadership is a type of visionary leadership that emphasizes the importance of discipline in one's own life first, then discipline within interpersonal relationships and organizations. "Principle-centered leadership introduces a new paradigm – that we center our lives and our leadership of organizations and people on certain 'true north' principles" (Covey, 1991, p. 18). These are examples of recent theories of leadership being taught to college students.

Mentoring, whether between students and faculty, students and staff, or less experienced leaders with those that are more experienced, can help students develop and refine both leadership styles and skills. Shandley (1989) stated, "Establishing a one-to-one relationship with a proven leader may serve to avoid or minimize the inevitable mistakes that come with the territory when one attempts to lead with no or minimal experience" (p. 61). Barsi, Hand, and Kress (1985) wrote of mentoring:

> The mentoring relationship also helps the student to internalize the technical skills that have been learned. The internalization of these skills, in combination with those existing personality traits that are also developed through the mentoring relationship, helps to produce the truly effective leader. (p. 29)

Physical and Financial Arrangements

Although most leadership programs continue to be a weekend or less in length, many more programs are offered each year. Bennis (1989) stated concerning leaders:

> They are not, by the way, made in a single weekend seminar, as many of the leadership-theory spokesmen claim. I've come to think of that one as the microwave theory: pop in Mr. or Ms. Average and out pops McLeader in sixty seconds. (p. 42)

Since there is an increase in the number of programs offered each year, it can be assumed that multiple programs allow students to experience leadership training throughout the year. It is also important to note that 28 percent of the responding institutions have advanced leadership programs. All of this allows students who take part in these programs to go through a longer-term learning process and consequently absorb and experience more concepts.

The 1997 study reported that over half of the responding institutions used a combination of on- and off-campus facilities. By remaining on-campus for shorter programs, more students are able to participate. By going off-campus for longer programs, attendees can acquire more in-depth information and get away from local distractions. The Simonds study agreed with the importance of getting away from the distractions of college life. This attitude has remained steadfast over time. Miles (1959) wrote the following:

> Getting a location out of the stream of work in the school seems to be important, even when students are involved. Schools using camps or conference houses for extended meetings have found that such facilities encourage hard work and the kind of creative thinking that is difficult when telephone calls and minor crises are

ever-present. Isolated settings also means that people eat and live together, which provides added support and informal learning. (as cited in Simonds, 1979, p. 92)

It is believed that using a combination of on- and off-campus facilities is helpful in the total leadership training process in order to have programs away from distractions and to have other programs that allow more students to participate. Because students' work and class schedules and the higher percentage of commuters, it is often difficult for them to get away for an extended period of time. Although these shorter programs may not be as effective as the weekend retreats, ways must be found to expose the greatest number of students as possible to leadership training. One possibility is to offer more short-term programs over an extended amount of time.

Colleges and universities have significantly increased their funding commitments to student leadership training programs. The 1997 study found that 47 percent of the programs cost over $3,000. The Simonds study found that only 5 percent spent over $3,000. Although the dollar is not worth what it was in 1979, it is believed that this change is due to the overall increase in university administrators' commitment to student leadership training.

Because of the variety of programs offered, the choice of locations, and the increased funding, more students are now able to participate. Thirty-three percent reported that the average number of participants was over 40, as opposed to the 17 percent reported in 1979. This also shows that student interest in these programs has increased.

Instructional Methods

The most used instructional method in both studies was the experiential method. As was noted previously, experiential training includes learning skills and knowledge through the use of structured exercises. This is most often done through small group discussions and problem solving, which are conducive to experiential learning in which students talk and work through the various topics of leadership. Bennis (1989) concurred: "The best information we have suggests that adults learn best when they take charge of their own learning" (p. 6). The social change model of leadership development also recognizes the importance of experiential learning through small groups and in-classroom and out-of-classroom experiences (p. 25).

Although over half of the respondents in the 1997 study reported using instructional technology in leadership training, it is still not used to the fullest extent possible. The Simonds (1979) study and the present study concur that the instructors of these programs do not recognize the educational potential of the technology.

The types of audiovisual aids being used currently reflect the technological changes that have occurred in the past 20 years. Videotape players, overhead projectors, computers, and compact disc players were all mentioned as having increased usage. It is predicted that, as equipment and software become more affordable and user-friendly, the use of computers, with their multimedia options, will replace the use of many of the other audiovisual aids.

Methods of Evaluation

Although most of the respondents felt that their programs were successful, there was no systematic basis for evaluating programs and documenting improvements in either 1979 or 1997. The majority of programs in both 1979 and 1997 were evaluated in writing immediately following the leadership training program. Alhough evaluation processes are in place, the majority of the respondents in both studies reported subjective evaluation processes -- observations, and feelings and impressions -- as the major ways of documenting improvement. Even though survey methodology increased, it was used by only 14 percent of the 1997 respondents. Over 25 percent in both studies reported that no documentation process was used.

It is encouraging that the use of survey methodology has increased, but there is still a lack of comprehensive evaluative processes. It is becoming increasingly more important for leadership training programs to be evaluated. Anthony-Gonzalez and Fiutak (1981) stated that because leadership programming techniques are seldom described in detail, "systematic and comprehensive analysis" of these programs has been difficult. "Furthermore, the lack of evaluative research has resulted in relatively unsophisticated methodology in this field" (p. 187). They also suggested three reasons why this systematic and comprehensive analysis should occur: (a) increasing pressure is applied for student affairs staff to document outcomes; (b) sound management techniques are increasingly emphasized in higher education; and (c) higher education is expected and even demanded to show program outcomes for use in determining support for such programs (p. 188). Not only do individual institutions hold departments accountable for

proving success in programs, but university systems, state higher education agencies, and regional accreditation associations also require every aspect of colleges and universities to be assessed. Objective evaluation processes are also needed to assist in modifying programs in order to increase effectiveness and to track long-term results of students who have gone through leadership training programs.

It may be that initiators of these programs do not have the time or expertise to implement systematic evaluative processes. Because 82 percent of staff members spend 50 percent or less of their time devoted to leadership training, as compared to 97 percent in 1979, it cannot be expected that the majority of these staff members have more time to spend on evaluation. However, it is recommended that student affairs staff be trained in objective evaluative processes. According to Upcraft and Schuh (1996), "Without assessment, student affairs is left only to logic, intuition, moral imperatives, goodwill, or serendipity in justifying its existence" (p. 12). Leadership training programs, as an integral service of student affairs, must develop and utilize systematic evaluations.

Discussion

As noted in chapter 1, the purpose of this study was to describe the most common practices of current college student leadership training programs in the United States and to compare the 1979 and 1997 findings. It was expected that the information gathered would enable student affairs professionals more effectively to project leadership training programs for the future. This section further examines some of the findings and recommendations and states implications for future research.

Studies on leadership training have been conducted since the late 1950s. The research since that time has proved that some things never change. Staff are involved in all levels of the development and implementation of leadership training programs, with the student activities office and dean of students office holding the primary responsibility. Evaluation processes that assess the goals of the program are essential to the overall success of leadership training programs. What has changed is that more colleges and universities have leadership training programs, student affairs professionals tend to be proactive rather than reactive, and instructional technology is utilized more.

Although there continues to be a struggle between academic and non-academic portions of colleges and universities, there seems to be an increase at some institutions in integrating the two worlds to produce the best leadership training programs. Several authors, including Gregory and Britt (1987), Marchetti (1985), McIntire (1989), Mitchell (1993), Roberts and Ullom (1989), and Romano and Hanish (1992) have emphasized this need for a partnership between academic and student affairs. This is also echoed by the social change model of leadership development. One of the primary purposes of colleges and universities is to produce future leaders. Academic and student affairs must do this together. Because academic affairs has the responsibility of teaching more specialized disciplines and student affairs has taken on the responsibility of leadership training, the two entities can work together.

Because the purpose of this study was not to investigate the tie between these two areas, future research is needed to identify successfully integrated programs. Specific points of information might include methods by which to get faculty involvement,

compensation for involvement, specific disciplines to be involved, and resolution of conflicts between student and academic affairs. Also important to consider is whether or not the program is student-affairs based or curriculum based. Programs that are academically based probably have more faculty involvement. Therefore, the two types of programs may need to be studied separately.

It is also important to note that, although the assessment and evaluative processes have been deemed to be of great importance by several leadership training programs, student affairs professionals still tend not to use scientifically based processes. Research should be done to develop processes that would be used specifically for student-affairs-based leadership training programs. Another way to insure greater involvement in the assessment and evaluative processes would be to develop a training program to teach student affairs professionals how to effectively and correctly assess student needs and evaluate programs. There is also a need for longitudinal studies specifically to address leadership in students going from college into their careers and community lives.

This study has found valuable information that applies to colleges and universities with and without leadership training programs. Although more institutions of higher education have developed leadership programs, many of these continue to lack a firm scientific basis in the development and evaluation of the programs. Faculty involvement continues to be low, but there is a need to integrate specialized classroom knowledge with leadership development knowledge. Partnerships between student affairs professionals and faculty can make this happen. It is expected that this study will provide future research initiatives in addition to practical data for student affairs practitioners.

Conclusions

There are significantly more leadership training programs at colleges and universities in 1997 than in 1979. The content of these programs reflects changes from the concepts used in 1979 to more recently developed concepts, theories, and models. Increasing effective leadership and increasing students' knowledge of their own leadership qualities remain the major goals of leadership training programs.

Student affairs staff members continue to have primary responsibility for these programs. They initiate, plan, implement, and evaluate. Staff members are spending a greater percentage of their time on leadership training. Increased support for leadership training programs can be seen through the increased funding and staffing that has occurred. Faculty members' greatest involvement continues to be as serving as instructors for the programs. They are not greatly involved in the planning and evaluation of programs.

Although the majority of programs are evaluated, there continues to be a lack of systematic evaluation and documentation processes. Written evaluations are used most often. The majority of the leadership training programs are evaluated immediately following the program. Observations, feelings, and impressions are the most reported methods for documenting improved leadership among college students.

Recommendations

Study Academic Affairs Based Programs and Integrated Programs

Studies need to be conducted on leadership training programs that are based in academic affairs and that are planned and implemented by both student affairs and

academic affairs. The number of these programs appears to be growing, but very few studies have examined their many aspects. These aspects could include faculty commitment, leadership studies' majors and minors, academic credit, fields of expertise of faculty members, faculty compensation, and assessment and evaluation of leadership training programs. Studies which examine programs that are planned and implemented by both student affairs and academic affairs could include the same aspects in addition to the division of responsibilities, motivations to work together, and guides to getting started.

Work More Closely With Faculty

Student affairs staff members who initiate, plan, and implement leadership training programs should include interested faculty in all phases of the program. Faculty, who hold discipline-specific knowledge, can add to the depth of leadership knowledge. They can assist in integrating curricular knowledge with extracurricular experiences. This integrated knowledge then allows a student to transfer his or her leadership from the college atmosphere to the work and community environments. Burns (1995) observed the following:

> Students can learn about leadership through formal courses, hands-on experience in leadership positions, and opportunities for guided reflection about leadership. Such education can help them become more effective as student leaders, as well as inspire them in developing their initial vision for future service as leaders beyond the college campus. (p. 244)

Use Needs Assessments to Plan Programs

Those who plan effective leadership programs for college students must first know their needs. Currently, subjective methods are used to evaluate the needs of students. A push for objective assessments should be made. Pre- and posttest techniques, written questionnaires, and leadership inventories can help to identify needs.

The newest methods -- leadership inventories -- attempt to differentiate between effective and ineffective leaders. With these results, programs can be designed to meet student needs. Students will thus become more interested in leadership discussions because vague topics of leadership will become more meaningful to them.

The Student-LPI, developed by Posner and Brodsky, is one such inventory. The constituent version can also provide students with additional information on how their leadership behaviors are received by others.

Develop and Utilize Objective Evaluative Processes

Objective evaluative processes should be developed utilized for college student leadership training programs. Although it is more difficult to initiate objective evaluative processes, it should be done to warrant the need for these programs to the various entities who accredit, fund, and support them. Furthermore, if a program is not objectively evaluated, how does one know if it is truly successful? Possible evaluative processes include survey and pre-and posttest techniques.

Repeat Study in 10 Years

This study or a similar study should be repeated in 10 years to discover if the number of programs will continue to grow; if student affairs and academic affairs will

work together to produce more effective leadership training programs; if more faculty members will serve as instructors; if the programs will reflect the models, theories, and practices of the times; what types of objective evaluative processes will be used; and how technology will effect leadership training programs. The use of an updated and less lengthy instrument should be considered for future studies.

Conduct Longitudinal Studies

Studies focusing on the long-term successes of student leadership training programs should be pursued. The 1979 and 1997 studies reported that improved documentation of programs was done through observations, feelings, and impressions. Most evaluations were conducted immediately following the program. There is a need to be able to study improvement of programs over periods of time using objective and systematic evaluative processes.

Prepare Student Affairs Professionals

Educational programs for student affairs professionals should prepare them for the many aspects of leadership training. Because leadership training programs have become more important on college and university campuses, the preparation programs for student affairs professionals should include the organization and administration of student leadership programs. Included in the organization and administration of these programs should be assessment and evaluation methodology.

Summary

People can be prepared to lead, but not all college graduates are leaders. For this reason, college student leadership training programs are important. The missions of many

institutions continue to call for the development of leadership in their students. However, classroom education has become more specialized, and less emphasis is placed on leadershiptraining. Therefore, student affairs professionals have taken the challenge to develop leaders.

APPENDIX A

LETTER TO SECURE COPYRIGHT PERMISSION

West Texas A&M
UNIVERSITY

Student Activities

September 15, 1993

Dr. Peter W. Simonds
Associate Dean of Students
College of the Holy Cross
1 College Hill
P.O. Box 4A
Worcester, MA 01610

Dear Dr. Simonds:

I would like to obtain copyright permission to use your survey instrument on leadership training programs for college student leaders. I am interested in examining the current trends in leadership training as compared to your 1978 findings. If you have any questions or would like to discuss this with me, please contact me at 806/656-2313. Thank you for your consideration in this matter.

Sincerely,

Keri Rogers

Keri Rogers
Director of Student Activities

A Member of The Texas A&M University System

WTAMU Box 914 • Canyon, Texas 79016-0001 • 806-656-2313

APPENDIX B

LETTER GRANTING COPYRIGHT PERMISSION

PETER W. SIMONDS
Associate Dean of Students

AD MAIOREM DEI GLORIAM

Telephone (508) 793-3487
Fax (508) 793-3020

November 29, 1993

Keri Rogers
Director of Student Activities
West Texas A&M University, Box 914
Canyon, Texas 79016-0001

Dear Ms. Rogers:

This letter is to authorize the use of my leadership questionnaire from my dissertation. My only stipulations are that its use is educational in nature and that you will send me a final report summarizing your results.

If you have any questions concerning this, please feel free to contact me. I wish you well in your research efforts.

Sincerely,

Peter W. Simonds

Peter W. Simonds
Associate Dean of Students

PWS/ess

ONE COLLEGE STREET
WORCESTER, MASSACHUSETTS 01610-2395

APPENDIX C

LETTER TO PARTICIPANTS

West Texas A&M
UNIVERSITY

Jack B. Kelley Student Center

December 31, 1996

Dear Colleague:

I am conducting a study of leadership training programs for college students. Leadership training programs have been held on college campuses for many years. The goal of this study is to provide a description of what is currently being done in this field as compared to what was being done in the 1970s.

I am asking you or the appropriate person to fill out the enclosed questionnaire and return it to me in the self-addressed, stamped envelope provided. This questionnaire should take no longer than thirty minutes to complete. (If you do not have a leadership training program, it will take only a few minutes to complete.) If you have any questions regarding this study, please contact me at (806)656-2394.

Your responses will be held in confidence. All data will be treated in the aggregate. No school or college will be identified in the study. This project has been reviewed and approved by the University of North Texas Committee for the Protection of Human Subjects (817)565-3940.

If you would like to have a summary of the findings and conclusions of this study, please indicate so on the final page of the questionnaire.

Thank you in advance for your cooperation and prompt reply.

Sincerely,

Keri Rogers McMillon

Keri Rogers McMillon
Director, Jack B. Kelley Student Center

A Member of The Texas A&M University System

WTAMU Box 266 • Canyon, Texas 79016-0001 • 806-656-2394 • FAX 806-656-2926

APPENDIX D

QUESTIONNAIRE

COLLEGE LEADERSHIP TRAINING PROGRAMS QUESTIONNAIRE

INSTRUCTIONS AND DEFINITION

Instructions:

1. This questionnaire is to be answered by colleges and universities which have and do not have leadership training programs.
2. Unless otherwise specified, answers should be indicated by placing a check mark next to the appropriate answer.
3. Sometimes special situations at your institution may require a response of "other" and a brief description of these special situations.
4. In no case are long, extensive responses necessary.
5. Please attach any additional information that you feel will enhance my appreciation and understanding of your leadership training program.

Definition:

Leadership training programs have been defined as specifically designed programs which present leadership knowledge and skills to undergraduate training programs for student government, student programming board and the entire range of student clubs and organizations. The leadership training program at your institution does not have to include all of the above groups to constitute a leadership training program for completing this study. A program for one of these groups would be sufficient. This definition does not include student-staff residence hall training, freshmen orientation staff training or peer-counseling training programs, although elements of leadership training are usually a part of these programs.

Who Should Respond:

This questionnaire has been mailed to the chief student affairs officer. Sometimes, the person to whom the questionnaire is addressed will no longer be at the institution or there may be a better informed staff member to answer questions on leadership training programs. When these circumstances arise, please forward this questionnaire to the staff member who is in the best position to answer it.

College Leadership Training Programs Questionnaire

I. GENERAL INFORMATION

1. What is the name of your college? _____

2. What is your title at your college? _____

3. What is the undergraduate student enrollment of your institution? (Use full time equivalent student figure.)

   1. _____ under 1,000
   2. _____ 1,000-4,999
   3. _____ 5,000-10,000
   4. _____ 10,001-20,000
   5. _____ over 20,000

4. Is your college?

   1. _____ public
   2. _____ private

5. What is the environment in which your college is located?

   1. _____ urban
   2. _____ rural
   3. _____ suburban

6. Which phrase best describes your college?

   1. _____ college without university connection
   2. _____ college within a university
   3. _____ university
   4. _____ other, explain _____

7. Which term best describes your college?

   1. _____ all male
   2. _____ all female
   3. _____ co-educational

8. What percentage of your students commute to college?

   1. _____ none
   2. _____ less than 25%
   3. _____ 25% to 50%
   4. _____ 51 to 75%
   5. _____ over 75%
   6. _____ 100%

II. THE PROGRAM(S)

9. Does your college conduct a student leadership training program(s)? (See definition.)

   1. _____ yes (go to item 13)
   2. _____ no (go to item 10)

ANSWER ITEMS 10 THROUGH 12 *ONLY* IF YOU *DO NOT* HAVE A LEADERSHIP TRAINING PROGRAM.

10. Are there plans at present for initiating a leadership training program?

    1. _____ yes, describe plans_____
    2. _____ no, explain why not _____

11. Has there been such a program for student leaders on your campus in the past 10 years?

    1. _____ yes, explain why it was discontinued _____
    2. _____ no

12. Would knowledge of programs at other colleges be of value in initiating or reinstating a program at your college?

    1. _____ yes, please comment _____
    2. _____ no, please comment _____

IF YOU HAVE *NO* LEADERSHIP TRAINING PROGRAM AT YOUR INSTITUTION YOU HAVE COMPLETED THIS QUESTIONNAIRE. PLEASE PLACE IT IN THE SELF-ADDRESSED, STAMPED ENVELOPE AND MAIL IT TO ME. THANK YOU FOR YOUR COOPERATION.

ANSWER ITEMS 13 THROUGH 67 IF YOU DO HAVE A LEADERSHIP TRAINING PROGRAM(S).

III. PURPOSES, GOALS, AND PLANNING

13. Rank in order the three most important purposes for establishing the leadership training program(s) at your college. (Place appropriate letter in the space provided next to the numbers.)

    1. _____ most important
    2. _____ second most important
    3. _____ third most important

    a. to increase student involvement in extracurriculum
    b. to train for future careers
    c. to improve relations between student groups
    d. to develop effective leadership skills
    e. to improve the coordination of student activities
    f. to promote smooth transition from year to year within student organizations
    g. to identify potential leaders early
    h. to develop an additional educational component for the student activities program
    i. other, explain

14. What is the most important goal of your leadership training program(s)? (Check only one.)

    1. _____ to increase the quality and/or quality of student activities
    2. _____ to develop cooperation between student groups
    3. _____ to increase effective leadership
    4. _____ to develop better communication skills
    5. _____ to provide opportunity for student leaders to get to know each other
    6. _____ to develop an understanding of the administrative procedures of the institution
    7. _____ to increase students' knowledge of their own leadership qualities
    8. _____ other, explain _____

15. Who initiated the establishment of the leadership training program(s)?

    1. _____ students
    2. _____ staff
    3. _____ student-staff committee
    4. _____ staff member with a special interest and/or knowledge of leadership
    5. _____ other, specify _____

16. Please indicate what percentage of the leadership training programs(s) has been planned by the following groups. (Provide percentage before group name.)

    1. _____% student
    2. _____% staff
    3. _____% student-staff committee
    4. _____% ad hoc committee set-up for this purpose
    5. _____% staff member(s) with special interest or knowledge of leadership
    6. _____% other, explain _____

17. Have you developed procedures that attempt to identify the leadership needs of the students?

    1. _____ yes (go to item 18)
    2. _____ no (go to item 20)

IF YES TO ITEM 17 PLEASE ANSWER ITEMS 18 AND 19; IF NO TO ITEM 17, GO TO ITEM 20.

18. How are these leadership needs identified?

    1. _____ informal discussions
    2. _____ interviews
    3. _____ structured discussions
    4. _____ written questionnaire
    5. _____ other, specify _____

19. Please estimate the number of people contacted to identify these leadership needs from each of the following groups. (Provide numbers.)

    1. _____ (provide number) students
    2. _____ (provide number) staff
    3. _____ (provide number) faculty
    4. _____ (provide number) other, explain

20. How long have you had a leadership training program(s)?

    1. _____ one year or new this year
    2. _____ 2-3 years
    3. _____ 4-6 years
    4. _____ 7 years or more (state number of years _____)

IV. STUDENT, STAFF & FACULTY INVOLVEMENT AND PARTICIPATION SELECTION

21. In which of the following offices does final responsibility rest for conducting your leadership training program(s)?

    1. _____ dean of students
    2. _____ student activities
    3. _____ student government
    4. _____ counseling center
    5. _____ academic department, specify _____
    6. _____ other, explain _____

22. Which office(s) participate(s) in the planning and implementation of the leadership training program(s)? (May check more than one.)

1. _____ dean of students
2. _____ student activities
3. _____ student government
4. _____ counseling center
5. _____ academic department, specify _____
6. _____ other, explain _____

23. Who is/are the instructor(s) for the leadership training program(s)? (May check more than one.)

1. _____ student(s)
2. _____ staff
3. _____ faculty
4. _____ outside consultant(s)
5. _____ other, explain _____

24. Is there one staff member who has primary responsibility for the leadership training program(s)?

1. _____ yes (go to item 25)
2. _____ no (go to item 27)
3. _____ more than one, specify number _____ (go to item 27)

IF YES TO ITEM 24 PLEASE ANSWER 25 AND 26, IF NO OR MORE THAN ONE, GO TO ITEM 27.

25. On an annual basis, what percentage of this staff member's time is devoted to the leadership training program(s)?

1. _____ less than 25%
2. _____ 25-50%
3. _____ 51-75%
4. _____ over 75%

26. Would the leadership program(s) continue at its present level, if the particular staff member primarily responsible for it were to leave?

1. _____ yes, why _____
2. _____ no, why _____

27. What criterion is used in the selection of student participants for the leadership training program(s)?

1. _____ all student leaders are invited
2. _____ participants are recommended by other students and/or staff
3. _____ any student may volunteer
4. _____ each student organization picks one representative
5. _____ a student is selected from each group by the group of people assigned the responsibility for selection
6. _____ any student may apply; interviews determine who will attend
7. _____ other, explain _____

28. Who participates in establishing the criterion for selecting participants for the leadership training program(s)? (May check more than one.)

1. _____ staff
2. _____ student(s)
3. _____ student/staff committee
4. _____ self-selections
5. _____ responsible staff member(s)
6. _____ other, explain _____

29. Rank order the three most important methods of interesting students in attending your leadership training program(s). (Place appropriate letter in the space provided next to the numbers.)

1. _____ most important
2. _____ second most important
3. _____ third most important

a. awarding of academic credit
b. requiring students in particular positions to attend
c. paying for attendance
d. providing parties while at program
e. promoting the intrinsic value of knowledge and skills gained during the program
f. suggesting use in future careers
g. other, explain _____

30. Is there one leadership training program given for all groups on campus?

1. _____ yes
2. _____ no

31. Are there separate leadership training programs given for individual student organizations, e.g. the programming board, student government, etc.; and/or groups of student organizations, e.g. fraternities?

1. _____ yes
2. _____ no

32. What percentage of the officers of student organizations attend the leadership training program(s)?

1. _____ less than 10%
2. _____ 10-25%
3. _____ 26-50%
4. _____ 51-75%
5. _____ over 75%

33. What percentage of the student participants is male?

1. _____ less than 10%
2. _____ 10-25%
3. _____ 26-50%
4. _____ 51-75%
5. _____ over 75%
6. _____ single sex institution, specify _____

34. Are special efforts made to equalize the ratio between male and female participants?

1. _____ yes, describe _____
2. _____ no

35. Rank order the three most important qualifications of the instructor(s) of the leadership training program(s). (Place appropriate letter in the space provided next to the numbers.)

1. _____ most important
2. _____ second most important
3. _____ third most important

a. academic degree(s)
b. experience with leadership training or related work
c. specific training courses (i.e. NTL)
d. personal interest in leadership training
e. knowledge of students at your college
f. professional reputation
g. other, explain _____
_____

V. THE CONTENT OF THE LEADERSHIP TRAINING PROGRAM(S)

36. Where is the emphasis placed in your leadership training program(s)? (Check only one.)

1. _____ effective leadership characteristics (e.g. intelligence, sensitivity, etc.)
2. _____ leadership behaviors (concern for individuals and concern for the task)
3. _____ leader-member interaction (needs of member are considered, leader solicits member's opinions on tasks)
4. _____ situational variables which effect leadership
5. _____ other, explain _____

37. Rank order the five most important topics emphasized in your leadership training program(s). (Place appropriate letter in the spaces provided next to the numbers.)

1. _____ most important
2. _____ second most important
3. _____ third most important
4. _____ fourth most important
5. _____ fifth most important

a. decision making
b. organizational development
c. assertiveness training
d. communication skills
e. consensus building
f. interpersonal relationships
g. peer relationships
h. conflict resolution
i. time management
j. planning
k. administrative skills
l. sensitivity training
m. listening skills
n. cross cultural skills
o. other, specify _____

38. Are any of the following concepts or materials incorporated into your leadership training program(s)? (May check more than one.)

1. _____ management by objectives (MBO)
2. _____ transactional analysis (TA)
3. _____ T-P Questionnaire
4. _____ University Associates' structured experiences (Pfeiffer and Jones)
5. _____ personal problems affecting job performance
6. _____ other, specify _____

VI. THE PHYSICAL AND FINANCIAL ARRANGEMENTS OF THE LEADERSHIP TRAINING PROGRAM(S)

39. Where is the leadership training program(s) conducted?

1. _____ on campus
2. _____ off campus
3. _____ both on and off campus

40. If conducted on campus, where on campus?

1. _____ student center
2. _____ residence hall
3. _____ classroom(s)
4. _____ seminar room(s)
5. _____ other, specify _____

41. If conducted off campus, where off campus?

1. _____ college owned retreat center
2. _____ hotel/motel
3. _____ conference center
4. _____ outdoor camping facility
5. _____ other, specify _____

42. The number of leadership training program(s) conducted this academic year will be:

1. _____ (provide number of programs)

43. The typical length of each leadership training program is:

1. _____ less than a complete 8-hour day
2. _____ one day
3. _____ weekend
4. _____ continuous on-going program
5. _____ other, specify _____

44. During what part of the year is/are the leadership training program(s) conducted?

1. _____ (provide month(s))

45. The approximate yearly budget (excluding college and staff salaries) for your leadership training program(s) is:

1. _____ none
2. _____ under $500
3. _____ $500-$1,000
4. _____ $1,001-$3,000
5. _____ $3,001-$5,000
6. _____ $5,001-$10,000
7. _____ over $10,000, specify amount _____

46. Our leadership training program(s) is/are paid out of:

1. _____ student government funds
2. _____ student activities funds
3. _____ university or college budget
4. _____ by participants
5. _____ a combination of the above, specify budgets and percentages of funds (e.g. "1" 50%, "3" 50%)
_____

47. The average number of participants attending a leadership training program is:

1. _____ under 10
2. _____ 10-20
3. _____ 21-40
4. _____ 41-60
5. _____ over 60, specify number _____

48. Which of the following groups are given priority in attending your leadership training programs(s)?

1. _____ no priority is given
2. _____ present student leaders
3. _____ newly elected or appointed student leaders
4. _____ potential student leaders (e.g. influential freshmen)
5. _____ other, specify _____

49. Which of the following class(es) is/are given priority in attending your leadership training programs(s)?

1. _____ no priority is given
2. _____ freshmen
3. _____ sophomores
4. _____ juniors
5. _____ seniors
6. _____ other, specify _____

VII. THE METHODOLOGY OF THE LEADERSHIP TRAINING PROGRAM(S)

50. Rank order the three most important methods used in transmitting the knowledge and skills of leadership in your leadership training program(s). (Place appropriate letters in the spaces provided next to the numbers.)

1. _____ most important
2. _____ second most important
3. _____ third most important

a. lecture
b. small group discussion
c. role playing
d. problem solving
e. sensitivity training
f. outdoor activity, specify _____
g. other, explain _____

51. What instructional method is most characteristic of your leadership training program(s)? (Check only one.)

1. _____ lecture (Instructors present concepts of leadership verbally and present examples of good leadership. Group discussions and questions and answer periods may be utilized.)
2. _____ experiential (Participants learn skills and knowledge of leadership by using structured exercises such as role playing, problem solving, etc. Feelings of the participants are discussed only to the extent that they help explain behavior.
3. _____ sensitivity (Participants discuss their feelings about sensitive subjects that affect their own leadership behavior such as self concept, and interpersonal relations.)
4. _____ other, explain _____

52. Are National Training Laboratory (NTL) methods used in your leadership training program(s)?

1. _____ yes (go to item 53)
2. _____ no (go to item 54)
3. _____ do not know (go to item 54)

53. If yes to item 52, why were NTL methods used? (Check only one.)

1. _____ NTL trainer available on campus
2. _____ outside consultant with NTL training used
3. _____ high quality of NTL professional reputation
4. _____ NTL materials are readily available
5. _____ other, explain _____

54. Which of the following audio-visual aids are utilized in your leadership training program(s)? (May check more than one.)

1. _____ videotape
2. _____ tape recorder (cassette recorder)
3. _____ films, specify titles _____
4. _____ other, specify _____

55. Are there advanced leadership training programs complementing the basic level leadership training program(s)?

1. _____ yes, describe _____
2. _____ no

VIII. THE EVALUATION OF THE LEADERSHIP TRAINING PROGRAM(S)

56. In your opinion, which term best describes your present leadership training program?

1. _____ highly successful
2. _____ successful
3. _____ average
4. _____ fair
5. _____ poor

57. If you have answered "average," "fair" or "poor" to item 56, what would improve it? _____

_____

58. Rank order the three most important accomplishments of your leadership training program(s). (Place appropriate letter in the space provided next to the numbers.)

1. _____ most important
2. _____ second most important
3. _____ third most important

a. increased student involvement in extracurriculum
b. training for future careers
c. improved relations between student groups _____
d. developed effective leadership skills
e. improved the coordination of student activities
f. promoted smooth transition from year to year in student groups
g. identified potential leaders early
h. provided an education setting for student activities
i. other, specify _____

59. Is/are the leadership training program(s) evaluated?

1. _____ yes (go to item 60)
2. _____ no (go to item 63)

IF YES TO ITEM 59 PLEASE CONTINUE, IF NO TO ITEM 59 GO TO ITEM 63

60. If yes to item 59, how is/are the evaluation(s) conducted?

1. _____ written (please provide a copy of the form used.)
2. _____ oral, describe _____
3. _____ other, _____

61. When does the evaluation(s) take place?

1. _____ immediately following the program(s)
2. _____ a week after the program(s)
3. _____ a month after the program(s)
4. _____ two months after the program(s)
5. _____ other, specify _____

62. Who conducts the leadership training program(s) evaluation?

1. _____ students
2. _____ staff
3. _____ student-staff committee
4. _____ staff member with special interest and/or knowledge of leadership
5. _____ other, specify _____

63. How is improved leadership documented? (May check more than one.)

1. _____ no documentation process
2. _____ observations
3. _____ feelings and impressions of staff and/or students
4. _____ survey research methods
5. _____ pre- and post-test research techniques
6. _____ other, specify _____

64. Since 1980, has your institution manifested an increased commitment to leadership training programs by increasing any of the following resources? (May check more than one.)

1. _____ no increased commitment has taken place
2. _____ staffing, explain _____
3. _____ funding, explain _____
4. _____ materials _____
5. _____ other, explain _____

65. Since 1980, have your students manifested an increased interest in leadership training programs?

1. _____ yes, explain _____
2. _____ no
3. _____ do not know

IX. OTHER PROGRAMS

66. Are there leadership training programs or workshops sponsored by organizations outside of your college which your students and/or staff attend? (ACU-I, NACA, NASPA, etc.)

1. _____ yes, give name and address _____
_____
_____

2. _____ no

67. It would be very important in describing leadership training programs, if you would provide program outlines, schedules, reports, evaluations, testing instruments, and any other materials you may feel would be helpful in providing me with a comprehensive picture of your leadership training program(s).

68. Would you like to have a summary of the findings and conclusions of this study?

1. _____ yes, please provide name and address _____
_____
_____

2. _____ no

THANK YOU FOR TAKING THE TIME TO COMPLETE THIS QUESTIONNAIRE. AFTER YOU HAVE COMPLETED THE QUESTIONNAIRE, PLEASE RETURN IT IN THE PROVIDED ENVELOPE TO:

Keri Rogers McMillon
Director, Jack B. Kelley Student Center
West Texas A&M University
WTAMU Box 266
Canyon, TX 79016-0001

APPENDIX E

REMINDER POSTCARD TO PARTICIPANTS

January 20, 1997

Dear Colleague:

A few weeks ago I sent you a questionnaire entitled, "A Study of Leadership Training Programs for College Student Leaders." To successfully complete my research, I ask that your responses from the survey be mailed to me no later than January 31. Please feel free to contact me at 806.656.2394 or keri.mcmillon@wtamu.edu if you have any questions concerning the questionnaire. Thank you again for your assistance with this research.

Sincerely,

Keri Rogers McMillon

APPENDIX F

FINAL LETTER TO PARTICIPANTS

February 10, 1997

Dear Colleague:

A few weeks ago I mailed you the enclosed questionnaire. It may have been put aside with the beginning of the semester or lost in the mail. Therefore, I have enclosed another one in the hopes that you or the appropriate person will take the time to answer the questions and return it by February 26. If this survey does not apply to your institution, please indicate this on the survey and return it to me in the enclosed envelope. You can also e-mail me at keri.mcmillon@wtamu.edu.

I ask that you assist me in obtaining my necessary rate of response, so the study will provide current and useful information on leadership programs at colleges and universities.

Thank you for assistance in this study.

Sincerely,

Keri Rogers McMillon

REFERENCES

Allen, K. E. (1990). Creating a new agenda for student leadership development. Campus Activities Programming, 23(3), 56-61.

Anthony-Gonzalez, M. L., & Fiutak, T. R. (1981). Evaluation of leadership programs. In D. C. Roberts (Ed.), Student leadership programs in higher education (pp. 187-207). Washington, DC: American College Personnel Association.

Astin, A. W. (1993). What matters in college? Four critical years revisited. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Barrow, J. C. (1977). The variables of leadership: A review and conceptual framework. Academy of Management Review, 2, 231-251.

Barsi, L. M., Hand, B. E., & Kress, J. L. (1985). Training effective student leaders -- back to the basics. NASPA Journal, 22(4), 26-30.

Bass, B.M. (1990). Bass and Stogdill's handbook of leadership: Theory, research, and managerial applications (3rd ed.). New York: Free Press.

Bennis, W.G. (1989). On becoming a leader. Reading, MA : Addison-Wesley.

Bennis, W.G., & Nanus, B. (1985). Leaders: The strategy for taking charge. New York: Harper & Row.

Boyer, E. L. (1987). College: The undergraduate experience in America. New York: Harper & Row.

Bradley, M. J., & Brown, L. E. (1989). Enhancing leadership development through the low adventure experience. Campus Activities Programming, 22(5), 48-54.

Breen, D. G. (1970). Survey of selected programs for student leadership training at colleges and universities. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Northern Illinois, De Kalb.

Brown, R. D. (1972). Student development in tomorrow's higher education – A return to the academy. Washington, DC: American College Personnel Association.

Burns, J. S. (1995). Leadership studies: A new partnership between academic departments and student affairs. NASPA Journal, 32(4), 242-250.

Caruso, R. (1981). Rationale. In D. C. Roberts (Ed.), Student leadership programs in higher education (pp. 7-15). Washington, DC: American College Personnel Association.

Cooper, D. L., Healy, M. A., & Simpson, J. (1994). Student development through involvement: Specific changes over time. Journal of College Student Development, 35, 98-102.

Cosgrove, T. J. (1988). Cleaning up our language about leadership. Campus Activities Programming, 21(3), 40-45.

Covey, S. R. (1991). Principle-centered leadership. New York: Summit

Crowton, F. E., & Cowden, D. J. (1955). Applied general statistics. New York: Prentice-Hall.

Daniel, W. W. (1990). Applied nonparametric statistics. Boston: PWS-KENT.

Delve, C. I., & Rice, K. L. (1990). The integration of service learning into leadership and campus activities. In C. I. Delve, S. D. Mintz, & G. M. Stewart (Eds.), Community services as values education (pp. 55-64). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Greger, I. (1959). Training of prospective student leader-guides. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Teachers College, Columbia University, New York.

Gregory, R. A., & Britt, S. K. (1987, Summer). What the good ones do: Characteristics of promising leadership development programs. Campus Activities Programming, 32-35.

Higher Education Research Institute. (1995). A social change model of leadership development: Guidebook (Version 2). Los Angeles: University of California

Hinkle, D. E., Jurs, S. G., & Wiersma, W. (1988). Applied statistics for the behavioral sciences (2nd ed.). Boston: Houghton Mifflin.

Kouzes, J. M., & Posner, B. Z. (1987). The leadership challenge: How to get extraordinary things done in organizations. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Larkin, W. V. (1981). Leadership classes. In D.C. Roberts (Ed.), Student leadership programs in higher education (pp. 43-50). Washington, DC: American College Personnel Association.

Lippitt, G. (1961). Leadership in action. Washington, DC: National Education Association, National Training Laboratories.

Lynch, A. Q. (1987). Type development and student development. In J. A. Provost, & S. Anchors (Eds.), Applications of the Myers-Briggs Type Indicator in higher education (pp. 5-29). Palo Alto, CA: Consulting Psychologists Press.

Manz, C. C., & Sims, H. P. (1989). SuperLeadership: Leading others to lead themselves. New York: Prentice-Hall.

Marchetti, J. J. (1985). Leadership training programs for student leaders on two-year college campuses (Doctoral dissertation, University of Pennsylvania, 1985). Dissertation Abstracts International, 45(02), A.

McIntire, D. D. (1989). Student leadership development: A student affairs mandate. NASPA Journal, 27(1), 75-79.

Mitchell, R. L. (1993). Lights and models: ACU-I's institute for leadership education and development. The Bulletin of the Association of College Unions-International, 61(5), 8-12.

Moore, T., & Parker, A. (1990). Celebrating change: The campus activities professional's point of view. Campus Activities Programming, 23(3), 36-39.

Olejnik, S. F. (1984). Planning educational research: Determining the necessary sample size. Journal of Experimental Research, 53(1), 40-48.

Posner, B. Z., & Brodsky, B. (1994). Leadership practices of effective student leaders: Gender makes no difference. NASPA Journal 31(2), 113-120.

Preissler, S. M., & Hadley, T. D. (1992). Leadership, academic major, and the career choices of college students. NASPA Journal, 29(2), 114-120.

Provost, J. A., & Anchors, S. (1987). Applications of the Myers-Briggs Type Indicator in higher education. Palo Alto, CA: Consulting Psychologists Press.

Pruitt, W. (1956). A study of the Center for Improving Group Procedures: An experiment in providing human relations education through university-related organization. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Teachers College, Columbia University, New York.

Roberts, D., & Ullom, C. (1989). Student leadership program model. NASPA Journal, 27(1), 67-74.

Romano, C. R., & Hanish, J. (1992). Comprehensive leadership development. The Bulletin of the Association of College Unions-International, 60(4), 22-25.

Shandley, T. C. (1989). The use of mentors for leadership development. NASPA Journal, 27(1), 59-66.

Simonds, P. W. (1979). Leadership training programs for college student leaders: A descriptive study. Dissertation Abstracts International, 40, 4922A. (University Microfilms No. D2266)

Stogdill, R. M. (1974). Handbook of leadership: A survey of theory and research. New York: Free Press.

Upcraft, M. L., & Schuh, J. H. (1996). Assessment in student affairs: A guide for practitioners. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Wright, D. K. (1967). Guidelines for initiating and developing undergraduate leadership training programs. Dissertation Abstracts International, 29(02), A. (University Microfilms No. D8515412)

Yukl, G. A. (1994). Leadership in organizations. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.